DR
370
.G66
1953

MUNIST YUGOSLAVIA

RICHARD D. GOODMAN

a239700c

THE REAL TRUTH
ABOUT
COMMUNIST YUGOSLAVIA

As Recognized by:

Mr. Janez Stanovnich,
Counselor of the Yugoslav Mission
to the United Nations,

In The Presence of Three Americans:

James Edwin Beveridge
Joseph Martin Proctor
Richard Douglas Goodman

LIBRARY
Southwest Texas State Teachers College
San Marcos, Texas

Erie, Pa., 1953

73410

Table of Contents

	Pages
Foreword	I-II
Introduction	III-VI
Chapter I—Collectivization: Looting and Robbery	1-13
Chapter II—Forceful Elections	14-25
Chapter III—Religious Persecution	26-40
Chapter IV—Death March and Massacres	41-51
Chapter V—The Peoples of Yugoslavia and Self-Determination	52-61
Chapter VI—United States-Yugoslav Relations	62-71
Chapter VII—Communists in the United Nations	72-74
Conclusion	75-76

Maps:

Ethnical Map of Yugoslavia	56
Political Map of Yugoslavia	57

FOREWORD

This dossier is dedicated to the millions of Yugoslav peoples who once in their history enjoyed the basic freedoms and inalienable human rights that we do, but who now suffer excruciating and uncivilized suppression under the infamous regime of a tyrant whose native country is Yugoslavia and whose selfish conduct, although ironic, is de facto oppressing and ultimately destroying the dignity and freedom of his own people. That man is Marshal Tito, the supreme ruler of Yugoslavia. He commands all authority in that far-off European land, and operates a Yugoslav Kremlin. His every whim and wish is mandatory law for everyone. His brutality and inhumane conduct is comparable to that of Hitler and Mussolini; his philosophy is that of a purely dedicated communist. The welfare of his peoples receives less attention and concern than we give to common animals. Tito is the privileged ruler, the people his underprivileged servants. Their tears, which are shed because of daily deprivation beyond description, and their imploring sighs, which emanate from withering bodies slowly losing the fundaments of life, do not find sympathetic audience. They daily beseech his mercy and kindness, but Tito's bestiality continues. Mercy, kindness and compassion find no home in his heart. Consequently, the only refuge for the Yugoslav peoples, even though it be psychological, is the realization of the freedom their ancestors once possessed in the now distant past. During the bloody days of World War Two they were severely oppressed by the Nazis and Fascists, and at the war's end a more cruel dawn awaited them, the tragedy of a nation was born. Communist Partisans, under the fanatical command of Marshal Tito, bathed the nation in blood in their quest for political power. After years of civil war and thousands of Yugoslav citizenry having been murdered, the people of this war-ravaged country were finally silenced by fear and threat of extinction. Under these circumstances, with the help of Allied Powers, Tito proudly grasped the reins of government, and ever since those fateful days in 1945 the destiny of the Yugoslav peoples has been guided and directed by him, a ruthless man who had to murder thousands of his countrymen in order to become their undesired leader. And yet, despite their years of torture and pain, they are still a religious people and their faith in God has remained their last and only hope. The substance of their daily prayers is that of all who are presently under communist rule—urgent pleas to God to release them from the yoke of communistic brutality. Someday, for them as well as for America, I hope that God will answer their humble and sincere petitions for a free existence.

Many Americans are not moved by the fact that the United States is presently giving military and economic assistance to Marshal Tito's communistic government. The reason for this passive attitude is that many of us are unacquainted with the Yugoslav Story. The following pages will reveal to the reader the true internal social, economic, religious and political conditions in Yugoslavia today. These facts were confirmed by a high official of the Yugoslav Government in a two hour conference that two friends and I had with Mr. Janez Stanovnich, Counselor of the Yugoslav Mission to the United Nations, in New York City in June of 1953.

After reading this dossier a more lucid and genuine understanding of the sufferings of the Yugoslav peoples will be made possible. Then, I am sure, the compassion which I have for my fellow man in Yugoslavia will be shared by my readers. We can then undertake a mutual responsibility and dedicate ourselves to the great and high task of effecting the eventual liberation of these peoples. We can and must pray to God for His counsel and assistance, for no great task such as ours was ever successfully completed without the guidance of our Father in Heaven.

Richard Douglas Goodman

July 2, 1953
Erie, Pennsylvania

INTRODUCTION

It was on a humid summer afternoon in June of 1953 that two fellow students and I, all from Erie, Pennsylvania, sped hurriedly down Fifth Avenue in New York City in an attempt to reach the Yugoslav Consulate Building for a very special conference which was scheduled for three-thirty. The gentleman with whom we were to confer was Janez Stanovnich, Counselor of the Yugoslav Mission to the United Nations.

I had learned through previous study and academic conversation the internal social, economic, religious and political conditions of Yugoslavia, and was documentarily acquainted with the many atrocities and crimes committed by the present Yugoslav Communist Government. Although these facts were firmly imprinted in my mind, some question about the veracity of what I had read and heard about Yugoslavia arose. And then, as the result of pursuant deliberation, my mind began to ponder this world problem. We had not yet arrived at our destination and I considered it best to make use of the time that remained in concentrated thought. I unattentively heard the conversation of my colleagues but confined myself to a conscientious mental analysis of the country with whose representative I was soon to speak. These thoughts entered my mind:

Since its creation in 1918 Yugoslavia has never been a democratic state . . . During World War II its peoples had suffered the tortures of Fascist and Nazi tyranny . . . Since 1945 they had experienced intimidation and suppression under the rule of the Yugoslav Communist Party and its head, Marshal Tito . . . Yugoslav Communism is no different from Russian Communism for both types stem from the same Marxian Communistic source and have identical objectives: After complete communistic socialization of their countries, not yet achieved, immediate implementation of world revolution, the final means of effecting a dictatorship of the proletariat over the entire world. (There is reason to believe that the separation between Tito and Stalin in 1948 had a more personal character—it was definitely not an ideological split for Tito's state policies and programs are indubitably communistic. We might also note that a more friendly attitude has been achieved since Stalin's death for both countries recently agreed to exchange ambassadors—a Russian ambassador again occupies his former position in Belgrade.) The national characteristics of Russian and Yugoslav Communism are accidental and of little importance. If Tito had the same military force at his disposal as the present Russian dictator, he would most certainly seek Yugoslav world domi-

nation. At the present, however, he is preoccupied with his insecure position in his own relatively small country. After Stalin's death an amicable parallelism towards communistic world domination can be completely realized.

After these ideas, firm personal convictions, arose, I considered Russia. As the reader will see, my mental conversation on this grave subject became more fluid and congruent:

The political and economic principles of Russian Communism are diametrically opposed to those of American democracy. Each of the basic tenets of Russian Communistic ideology is the antithesis of its counterpart in American political organization. Soviet Communists consider dictatorship the ideal and natural form of government in human society, and their spokesmen express nothing but contempt and hatred for democracy and democratic institutions. The guarantee of individual liberty and the exercise of free economic initiative are foreign to the concepts of Soviet Communism. Such political activity as is permitted under this system is limited to a single political party which, in the case of Russia, is the Communist Party. The extermination of opposing political parties results in the elimination of free elections, and the legislative branch of the Government, composed entirely of members of the only existing party, becomes merely a rubber stamp for the decisions reached by the party leadership. All powers are concentrated in the chief-of-state, who has not been chosen by the freely expressed will of his countrymen but has attained power as head of the single political party. Russian Communistic ideology, furthermore, rejects the doctrine of individual political equality, which is expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. Proceeding on this premise, the Russian High Command has adopted and pursued with great energy a foreign policy aimed at the establishment of complete Russian hegemony in Europe and eventual world domination. This evil foreign policy, dedicated to destruction of human liberty and dignity, has been realized to a great extent throughout the world. The Soviet satellites of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Communist China, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, East Germany and North Korea are merely instruments of Russian imperialistic policy.

It has been known for a long time that an international communist spy ring is in operation in almost all fields of important endeavor. The testimony of David Greenglass, brother of the executed atom spy Ethel Rosenberg, reveals the truth of this statement. Hundreds of similar testimonials could be cited to prove this point. Congressional investigating committees have found that dedicated communists are now and have for a long time been infiltrating our schools, our

radio, television and motion picture industries, our churches, our newspapers, magazines and all other related journalistic material, and even the highest echelons of our state and federal government. This is also true in many other countries of the world. At this moment, Russian-directed international communism is the greatest single threat to mankind. Through years of infiltration, propaganda, espionage, purges, war and outright premeditated murder, often made possible by the unquestionable stupidity or irresponsible passive attitude of both American and foreign administrations, communism has attained the gigantic strength that it has in today's world. Its influence is spread throughout the length and breadth of the globe, and it enjoys complete political control over eight hundred million people, a third of the total world population.

Human nature values liberty, freedom and equality, for all of the major wars in our history were fought for the preservation of these same essential human rights. The bloody battlefields of the last two world wars are within the realm of our memory; consequently, many of us know the real implications of a struggle for freedom. We have been engaged in a conflict in Korea for a similar purpose. In the early part of the century we fought Fascism and Nazism—now we are fighting communism, although in a limited way (in one corner of the world we are doing our utmost to defeat Russian Communism—though some world leaders still trust Russia and are inclined to accept false Russian peace overtures—while in another corner of the world we are the financeers of Yugoslav Communism).

Yugoslavia again entered the secret portals of my thought. What is Yugoslavia's function in the family of nations? Why should we be so deeply concerned about a communist regime that is considered, although erroneously, a Western Ally? Why? Why? Why?

The Yugoslav Government honors the same communistic philosophy as Russia and its methods of governing are identical. Marshal Tito, the Yugoslav leader, has proudly proclaimed that he is one of the world's greatest living communists. The Yugoslav communist president, his officials and representatives, are dedicated Marxists. What more must we know? According to the moral and ethical standards of the United Nations, as enunciated in its Charter, such political ideas and systems are denounced. And yet, Russia, her satellites and Yugoslavia are formally accepted members of this international communal organization. Furthermore, Yugoslavia, one of these communist states, presently receives military and economic aid from the United States' Government. What has happened to the family of nations when it

betrays the Charter that was multilaterally written and mutually agreed upon only a few short years ago? What has happened to our American sense of morality and ethics when we betray our own Constitution, Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights by giving financial and military succor to a communist state such as Yugoslavia?

And at that moment, while in a state of bewilderment, lamentation, and even disgust, I was interrupted by a short announcement: "We're here, Doug." I am certain that my colleagues must have considered my external expression rather confusing, for all of us left the car without comment.

The Author

CHAPTER I

Collectivization: Looting and Robbery

Our party arrived at No. 834 Fifth Avenue, the spacious and fabulous official residence of the Yugoslav Delegation to the United Nations, promptly at three-thirty. It would be difficult to describe the interior beauty of this 'capitalistic' mansion—it impressed us deeply to see how luxuriously a group of communists live, especially when these same individuals express such bitter hatred towards capitalism in general and the bourgeois class in particular. And yet, this very residence was the result of a capitalistic, free enterprise economy guided by the uncoerced hands and minds of a united people. This is a proof that those who lead the communist state actually represent a privileged class, "a new bourgeoisie" —in the words of Nickolas Berdiaev—"more brutal and lustful than the former."[1] At the same time the thousands of human souls who live behind the sealed walls of an Iron Curtain do not know the true meaning of a decent home and substantial food.

The courteous and personable receptionist who greeted us in the main hall appeared American in every respect. She was modestly yet magnificently clothed, and spoke English perfectly. During the course of our conference with Tito's representative she interrupted us to deliver a message to her employer in a foreign language, obviously one of the Yugoslav languages. She thus impressed us as being a woman of some Yugoslav nationality. Without any adieu we immediately introduced ourselves. She stated that the Counselor was occupied at the moment and related his apologies for being late. We were then ushered into a richly furnished drawing room and told to wait for the United Nation's representative of the Yugoslav Communist Government. After a few moments passed the door opened and a short, plump gentleman joined us. Mr. Stanovnich grinned, exchanged courtesies, and said with a note of abruptness: "I understand that you have a few questions to ask me. Are you prepared to begin?" And so the two hour conference began, a conference that confirmed many startling truths about the oppression, brutality and satanic cruelty imposed upon the Yugoslav peoples by the Tito Government. We were also destined to learn of the firm and resolute acceptance of communistic philosophy by the entire Yugoslav Government, and of its pragmatic, utilitarian policy measures.

[1]Berdiaev, Nickolas, **Christendom and Class Struggle**, p. 29.

Because of the fact that I had read and heard abundant reports from very reliable sources on the chaotic internal economic conditions of Yugoslavia, I thought it best to discuss this subject first. The following dialogue includes in detail the questions posed and the answers received:

Q. Mr. Goodman—In addition to detailed personal study I have received valuable information from very reputable sources concerning the various economic principles, problems and policies of the Yugoslav Government. I place most emphasis, concern and importance, however, on the economic policy measures of your government because, according to world opinion, there is a question of human rights involved. I am particularly interested in the collectivization program now in operation, and am told by numerous objective informants that your government seized most all of privately owned property at the close of the last war in order to institute a national collectivization program. Is this true?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—I might preclude my remarks by stating that I am not at all certain that you received your information from honest and reputable individuals, for your comments are not entirely accurate. In answer to your specific question, however, I can say that the Yugoslav Government officially launched a collectivization program immediately after the last war, and tried to do it as peacefully and uncoercively as possible. You evidently realize, however, that some hostile opposition was met and that the gravity of our country's economic situation at that time obviously necessitated immediate implementation of forceful measures.

Q. Mr. Goodman—Could you enumerate some of these 'forceful measures' for me?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—All of these measures are not within the realm of my memory because I was not associated with our economic program at that time. ***I do know, however, that if*** *the peasants refused to recognize the "common good" and surrender their property to the state that we were forced to seize the property without their consent.*

Q. Mr. Goodman—That is precisely the point that I wish to discuss. It is recognized that the common good should always be served by the government and that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people is the requisite of a peaceful, harmonious and united society. Seizure of private property, however, is another question. In my opinion, commonly shared by most states and peoples, that meas-

ure is outright violation of an essential human right and is therefore not serving the common good.

(I was angrily interrupted at this point.)

A. Mr. Stanovnich—You do not know what you would do if you were presented with the same crisis as we were in 1945! Our peoples were starving and lacked the essentials of a normal existence. Something had to be done and we were determined to alleviate the situation by whatever means possible. The principle of collectivization was introduced and seemed to be the only solution, and we embarked upon the program with a firm determination. *Because of this, no one was permitted to resist the government.*

Q. Mr. Goodman—Did you try to educate the people as to why such a drastic administrative measure had to be taken, or attempt to seek their advice as to how the economic situation could be improved and corrected?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—No, we did not. They were merely told that state collectivization was the only solution and would be done in the interest of the "common good" of the entire nation. To educate them would have consumed valuable time, and to have sought their advice would have been unthinkable for many reasons.

(It is known that communistic governments never seek public opinion on contemplated state policy in a particular field. However, Mr. Stanovnich seemed to place great emphasis upon the importance of government dedication to the "common good" and therefore was expected to be somewhat concerned about Yugoslav public opinion. His remarks, however, indicated that such a procedure is not in accordance with the dictatorial Yugoslav Communist Party's policy. He directly admitted that the masses are ignored in his country and are merely *told* what to expect, their opinions and protests notwithstanding.)

Q. Mr. Goodman—With these remarks in mind I cannot imagine a more flagrant violation of the essential human right to private ownership, recognized by man from the very beginning of civilization. First of all you stated that state collectivization was made mandatory by force of circumstances. Then you continued by asserting that the "common good" was always in sight. In conclusion you remarked that forceful measures were implemented in order to insure the realization of state objectives. It logically follows, therefore, that the "common good," as your government understands it, necessitates complete subservience to the governing group,

and that is unquestionably the reverse of what is usually conceived to be the common good. In most democratic countries of the world that term applies to what is best for all of the people, and not the select few who are in power. Anything that the government wishes to do must be carefully and prudently considered, and public opinion is often the decisive factor. That is true state recognition of the common good. According to your remarks, however, the Yugoslav Government does whatever it wishes regardless of the adverse opinion of its populace. Is this the purpose of the Yugoslav Government? Is this your method of serving the common good?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—The purpose of any government, Mr. Goodman, is to direct and govern its people, to do what is necessary and important. Often times governmental measures must be instituted without the consent of the governed, and it is ridiculous to think that we could effectively function otherwise. I can cite numerous examples of where the United States' Government has performed specific functions and operations without first of all receiving public approval. *We in Yugoslavia also do this and, in many cases, find it necessary and expedient to ignore the masses.* If you examine history you will find that such action is not unparalleled.

(The last part of my question, regarding the Yugoslav method of serving the common good, remained unanswered, and this factor seemed most significant to me. Either Mr. Stanovnich was unable to answer the question or found it expedient to refrain from comment, for at this point he was confused and somewhat angered. I did not pursue the point because I felt that I had received a sufficient answer in the highly revealing remarks already made.)

Q. Mr. Goodman—Do you think that your government can forever operate without the consent of the governed?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—We are not in the least concerned about this matter for it poses no serious or immediate threat. At the present time we are supported by approximately seventy to eighty per cent (according to communist statistics) of the entire populace, and therefore have nothing to worry about. *If some dilemna should arise, our government is at any time equipped and prepared to silence imperialistic and selfish opposition.*

(Please note that Mr. Stanovnich stated that seventy to eighty per cent of the populace support the present Yugoslav Dictatorship. Although it is a matter of historical record that this is not true, we can only accept the Counselor's state-

ment at face value. If this large percentage does support the Tito Government, why is that same government 'equipped and prepared to silence imperialistic and selfish opposition?' Obviously Mr. Stanovnich is too aware of the fact that his figure is grossly exaggerated, that there is constant threat of civil revolution in his country. That is the only apparent reason why his government finds it necessary to maintain unrelaxed armed vigil against any such eventuality.

Having received the Yugoslav Government's own confirmation of its brutal tactics, I felt that our purpose had been fulfilled. However, I thought it both wise and prudent to receive more confessions from Mr. Stanovnich, who was evidently off-guard, and so cautiously continued.

Q. Mr. Goodman—I am happy to receive the pertinent information just given us, Mr. Stanovnich.

(The Yugoslav Communist squirmed uneasily in his chair.)

However, our interest lies more in the field of the collectivization program inaugurated in 1945 and reportedly still in operation. Will you agree that these economic measures were too harsh and often deprived your peoples of their essential human rights?

(His reply was the crucial breaking point of the entire conference and startled us beyond description. We had never expected an official of the Yugoslav Government to admit what Mr. Stanovnich did. His confession should have been heard by all the Western World for no longer should democratic states and peoples remain friendly and above all assist the present Yugoslav Government in the military and economic field. I shall always remember the following statement.)

A. Mr. Stanovnich—*We know that our economic program was erroneous in many ways from 1945 to 1952, that we did wrong according to American standards. In many cases we were too radical and overlooked the fundamental rights of our peoples. But something drastic had to be done. There were too many farmers and not enough land. At the close of the last war Soviet Russia had to kill two or three million peasants in order to equalize farm ownership and properly distribute the wealth. A government must have an objective and use any means to attain that objective. Ours was to equalize distribution of property, and we used any means to achieve that goal. Now that we are aware that our economic policy has forcefully deprived our peoples of the right of private ownership, we have recently authorized them to leave*

the collectives. I can assure you, however, that the Yugoslav Government will never permit free enterprise!

(Although Mr. Stanovnich may not have then realized it, he had in the above words endorsed the information that I had previously received from my many informants, and thereby directly admitted the injustice and brutality of his government. His comments only proved the sincerity and integrity of the exiled Yugoslav peoples with whom I have often conferred. Only one additional point remained questionable, but he was soon to verify that one also.)

Q. Mr. Goodman—You mentioned that recent constitutional changes permit your peoples to leave state collectives at any time with the guarantee that their property will be returned. According to a report which I have received from a representative of an American business firm who inspected Yugoslavia several months ago , such moves would not improve or better the conditions of the people even if they were to do this. My informant also told me that if the people do choose to leave the collectives that the government taxes them so heavily that return to the state program is mandatory. In other words, your constitutional changes theoretically permit such action but make no mention of what course the government will take in order to discourage moves of this sort. According to the evidence available, the governmental action about which I am speaking is excessive taxation.[2] Is this true?

(Note the lack of logic in Mr. Stanovnich's reply.)

A. Mr. Stanovnich—*The report of your informant is totally erroneous. However, we do tax those who leave collectives more heavily than those who remain in the state program, and this is done for obvious reasons. Those who refuse to recognize and serve the "common good" (meaning the "common good" as it applies to the communist government) should be punished and so we do this in two ways: 1) their property tax is more severe than if they were in collectivized state employment, and 2) they, as private workers, receive fewer advantages and services from the state than do state workers. This is our way of bringing them in line.*

(Finally a most important point had been officially clarified

[2]"According to recent reports from Croatia and Serbia, the new steep taxes imposed upon peasant proprietors have already compelled many of them to give up the fight and join newly organized collective farms," says Bogdan Raditsa, Tito's former Press Chief.

by a representative of the Yugoslav Government. I had been seeking this clarification for many months. It is now a certitude that reports about recent constitutional changes in Yugoslavia which guarantee the people more liberty and freedom are completely false. Mr. Stanovnich told me that himself.)

Mr. Goodman—Thank you, sir, for your information. I think that our discussion of your government's economic program is quite sufficient. Let us now pursue another field.

Author's Commentary

It is certain that many questions must be solved before the second part of this conference is presented. Some principles and problems connected with the Yugoslav post-war situation have been introduced in this chapter and it is the author's duty to bring them into closer perspective. We shall strive to do this in succeeding paragraphs.

The reader will readily notice that the technical sociological term of "common good" has been used and applied throughout the preceding paragraphs. It is obvious that our democratic application of social justice is a complete deviation from that of the Yugoslav Communist Government, or any communist government. We in the Western World, especially America, recognize and honor the fundamental individual social, economic, political and religious human rights as inalienable rights of man. Our governmental functions and operations seldom lose sight of these divinely bestowed inviolables. In communist states such as Yugoslavia, however, these fundamental rights are not considered inalienable rights of man for in a totalitarian state such as Yugoslavia, man is subordinate to the "state," i.e. the ruling group. Everything in the individual and social field is judged from the point of view of its usefulness to this governing group. More specifically, the communistic conception of "common good" about which we are speaking is the "common good" which is advocated by Mr. Stanovnich, a self-professed communist. Every private thing that is sought by communistic individuals as good and useful for them can be, and usually is, taken, i.e. expropriated, and becomes "common good." Although it appears comical, it has a very realistic significance when the subjects of communist states, in emphasizing the abuse of civil authority by communist officials, often quote the familiar axiom, an applied communist principle, *"What is yours is mine and what is mine, my own."* Any means, regardless of their moral or ethical nature, are utilized for procurement of their "common

good," for Mr. Stanovnich, in his remarks, defiantly declared: *"In pursuit of our objectives, we are justified in using any means to achieve a specified goal." These means are technically referred to as "administrative measures" and include deprivation of liberty, forced labor, imprisonment, and inconceivable torture techniques.* As one can obviously recognize, these communist administrative measures and methods are actually superlative manifestations of Machiavellian philosophy, a philosophy which enunciates that man can use any means, whether good or evil (deceit, cruelty etc.), to achieve his desired end. In succeeding paragraphs I shall concretely describe how the Yugoslav Communist Government applied their conception of common good.

In the prelude of our conference, Mr. Stanovnich reflected on the critical economic circumstances of his country immediately after the war. It is true that there was lamentable destruction and devastation throughout the land, that poverty and misery had indiscriminately stricken large masses of the population, including communist partisans. Our concern about this grave problem, however, is associated with the communist methods of alleviating these chaotic internal economic circumstances. In lieu of democratic means of correcting economic disaster, Yugoslav communist authorities chose state collectivization, i.e. seizure of private property. The inevitable result of this totalitarian measure was additional deprivation, poverty, and general human anguish and suffering. From the very beginning of communist Yugoslavia the Yugoslav peoples were indescribably poor and lacked the material means of maintaining normal existence, and the communist method of correcting these deplorable conditions is unbelievable. Instead of instituting methods that would eventually give the already starving peoples more daily essentials, communist policies actually increased the severity of deprivation, for the Yugoslav peoples, as a result of collectivization, actually had less than before. Instead of giving the people something, the Yugoslav Government took everything from them, and we can all realize the evils that resulted. Moreover, regardless of these sad conditions, Mr. Stanovnich and his government still condone the collectivization measure and bitterly scorn their peoples for resisting a program that deprives them not only of normal living standards but also of their fundamental human rights.

In order to elaborate with more authority post-war Yugoslav economy measures, as applied to the upper-middle class (owners, businessmen, tradesmen etc.), additional facts and details must be included (the collectivization referred to in

the previous dialogue applied primarily to rural districts). So that the reader can be completely certain of the truthfulness of these facts and details, I wish to state that all of the following information has been received from the most reputable authorities available on Yugoslav internal conditions. The names of these sources are withheld, however, for security reasons, but are always available to interested and sincere observers. The additional special information is as follows:

In 1945, particularly in urban areas, the communist leaders of Yugoslavia summoned the majority of remaining industrialists to public meetings which were especially designed to solicit and secure the latter group's complete cooperation with governmental economic rehabilitation policies. Following these public conclaves, even the most loyal industrialists, who promised their immediate and unqualified cooperation and, in addition to this, placed half of their capital at government disposal, were secretly murdered and their property expropriated by OZNA (Yugoslav Secret Police — now called UDBA). Those that survived this inhumane brutality were subjected to trial in Peoples' Courts (courts where judges, juries, witnesses and public are themselves communists and in the employ of the state) and, on the basis of false accusations and premeditated charges, were sentenced to prison or forced labor. In the meanwhile, all their property was confiscated and members of their immediate family also placed in state prisons and concentration camps. In this way, the Yugoslav Communist Government realized, through theft, murder and robbery, general expropriation and collectivization throughout the country shortly after its seizure of political power in 1945. It is no wonder that these measures caused additional economic crisis, poverty, and incomparable human misery. Consequently, no success has been achieved in the economic field. Evidence of strong rural resistence from 1945 until today is available, indicating that the Yugoslav Government's plan of permanent socialization is a total failure and practicably impossible. Therefrom the Yugoslav Communist Government's cry for United States' economic aid is understandable.

It has already been stated in the Introduction that there is no indication of essential difference between Russian and Yugoslav Communism, and, in view of the above facts, we can immediately see that Yugoslav economy policies are identical with those used by the Soviet Union from 1917 to 1921. That both countries have consequently suffered from ensuing evils is an irrevocable certitude, for a careful study of history reveals the following:

During the period of the Civil War extreme economic policies were instituted in the U. S. S. R. All means of production—land, labor, capital and business enterprise—were nationalized, private trade was forbidden, and farmers' produce above immediate needs was confiscated. These same measures were applied by Communist Yugoslavia after the cessation of hostilities in 1945. The result in Yugoslavia now, as in Russia before, is total economic chaos. Farmers, in a courageous struggle for survival, hoarded and concealed their grain or refrained from planting. *Factory production fell disastrously. The government had increasingly to resort to forcible measures, both to combat its political opponents and to mobilize labor and collect grain.* As stated before, multitudes of innocent Yugoslav peoples were the sole victims of their government's economic ineptness. Their frequent protests to those who governed were unfavorably received and strong organized resistance has been in operation ever since. The same course of action was taken by the Soviet peoples. Hostility to rigid controls and Party domination led to peasant revolts in 1920 followed the next year by the Kronstadt Rebellion, an openly organized political opposition demanding "soviets without Communists" and "free artisan production without individual labor." The last significant outbreak of its kind under the Soviet regime, the Kronstadt Rebellion, together with the great famine of 1921, served great warning to governmental authorities.

Because of near revolutionary opposition on behalf of both Yugoslav and Russian citizens, the governments concerned recognized the need for modifications in economic policy. In proclaiming their New Economic Policies, Russian and Yugoslav leaders proudly declared: "We are taking one step backwards in order to make two steps forward." The following sentences will plainly reveal that their idealistic hopes and dreams were not realized, that the new horizon that they expected to one day see did not appear.

Lenin, the political leader of Russia, introduced the famous New Economic Policy. Free markets were restored for both peasants and workers. After paying a compulsory proportional tax, farmers were free to dispose of their harvest as they desired. Privately owned shops reopened and a new class of individual entrepreneurs (popularly called Nepmen) made their appearance. However, heavy industry and foreign trade remained nationalized and the government worked actively to consolidate its position in other fields as it gave ground in the economic. When evidence of progress was finally realized, Lenin died, and, after years of ruthless and

unscrupulous political struggle, was succeeded by Joseph Stalin. The new government immediately discarded NEP and once again (from 1928-1936) all phases of Russian economy were nationalized. The widespread resistance to this policy, although resulting in temporary relaxation of pressure, was effectively and brutally suppressed and an overwhelming majority of farms were collectivized. Since 1936 Russia has tried Five Year Plans again and all of them have been unsuccessful.[3]

Yugoslavia's Tito also realized the danger of oppositionary revolution in his country because of his implementation of Soviet economic measures and, in 1952, initiated a New Economic Policy of his own. This policy, however, did not advocate denationalization but rather, in a theoretical sense only, some minor changes in the former collectivization program. Practically, however, Yugoslav economic policies remain the same as they were back in 1945 and, as Mr. Stanovnich assures us, the Yugoslav Government "will never permit free enterprise." Therefore, no essential changes have been made and poverty still curses the people.

Appendix

Following are selected quotations from responsible individuals who have toured Yugoslavia in recent years and know what the true internal economic conditions are:

ADVENTURE IN TITO-LAND

"Radios—even the cheapest sets—cost $200 . . . Cameras or film don't exist at any price . . . Cars or accessories are also nonexistent; I doubt if there is a privately owned motor car in the whole country. Gasoline you can buy at 60 cents a gallon, but I think that it would take Tito himself to get you a permit to buy a tire or spare part.

Clothes prices are fantastic, which accounts for the poverty-stricken appearance of the populace. The cheapest suiting runs about $12 a yard; imported cloth suits at $20. And this in a country where a university professor earns $60 a month; a doctor, $70; bus drivers, $40; and day laborers, $20. Tailors spend most of their time sewing on patches. In an effort to force citizens to purchase commodities other than food with their meager earnings, the government insists on the payment of about a fourth of all salaries in coupons. These coupons are only good for nonedible products."

Don Smith
(Holiday Magazine, August, 1953, p. 36)

* * *

"It is impossible to conceive of a more ragged population, of children not being able to attend school because they have no shoes or proper clothing. Here is a Communist paradise where the average worker's monthly wage is 7000 dinars, where a mediocre pair of shoes costs 5000

[3]Information about Soviet Russia is taken from: Major Foreign Powers, Carter, Ranney, and Herz, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952) pp. 456-7.

dinars, a cheap shirt 3000, and a suit a year's work. (300 dinars is officially equal to $1 in American money.)

Private enterprise has been completely eliminated in Tito's new order. But a government monopoly in all fields of business has not lowered prices. On the contrary, with all competition eliminated, the regime is free to charge exorbitant prices and reaps fantastic profits, all to the detriment of Comrade Citizen.

. . . Tito has proclaimed an end to collectivization but it continues as the effect of the government's new policy of 'arundation.' "

Andrew Diakun,
Graduate of the University of Buffalo Law School
(Statement from Buffalo Evening News)

* * *

"There is no freedom in Yugoslavia—believe me. They are all slaves! Slaves in tears and patches! Shoes cost $20 and the average worker makes $3 a week.

Every American should spend one week in Yugoslavia. We'd never complain after that. I thank my mother a million times for bringing me here 40 years ago."

Mrs. Andrew T. Serbach
(Statement from Buffalo Evening News)

* * *

"Conditions are simply appalling; nobody but a Yugoslav can describe them adequately; the cost of living has reached a stage when life cannot be supported on salary; the secret police are vigilant — throw grumblers into prison for years without a trial, etc.

Three per cent of the people of Yugoslavia support the present regime . . . Some have declared that Yugoslavia is plain hell . . .

Today razor blades, needles, shoe laces, safety pins, boot polish, corsets, and so forth, are worth almost their weight in gold."

George Bilainkin
(Contemporary Review, January, 1951, p. 11.)

* * *

"Yugoslavia faces great economic and political weakness, as well as military. Tito has already received $256 million in handouts — chiefly from the United States. It has been utterly wasted by a bungling **Communist bureaucracy . . .**

The overwhelming majority of Yugoslav farmers are against Tito (nation is eighty per cent agricultural — well over one half of the people are anti-Tito) . . . It is sad to see people who work so hard get paid so miserably by such an impossible system. A Yugoslav Flit gun now costs the worker the equivalent of $2.40. This is about as much as he makes per week working twelve hours a day . . .

The Yugoslav Government's failures have been alibied by all kinds of excuses. **But the real reason for its failure is in the nature of the** Communist system itself, and nothing else. No wonder that inside his own country Tito is the most hated man in Yugoslavia."

Henry J. Taylor
(Readers Digest, November, 1951, p. 22.)

"The forced imposition of a Communist economy had the same initial consequences in Yugoslavia as elsewhere; famine, starvation, disruption of commerce and distribution, and the creation of new vested interests to supplant the doomed classes of the old society. Tito introduced what he calls his NEM (New Economic Measures) to preserve the essential elements of the first revolutionary period, complete the destruction of free enterprise, and continue the Five-Year Plan introduced shortly before the break with Moscow . . .

The past year in Yugoslavia has witnessed an amazing display of resistance by the peasants to all attempts to make them accept subjugation to the Communist regime. Tito's only answer to this defiance is the promise of new controls on farm production and redoubled government efforts to communize the countryside . . . "

Bogdan Raditsa,
Former Press Chief to Marshal Tito

23410

CHAPTER II

Forceful Elections

If we take cognizance of those remarks of Mr. Stanovnich which were included in the previous chapter and objectively deliberate their real implications, we shall readily recognize the lack of humaneness in the Tito Government. (Certainly the most passive of observers should at least be somewhat disturbed about the economic measures employed by the Yugoslav Communist Government and, in consequence, this group's impression of that government, if there is some present sympathy for it, should undergo considerable alteration. There is no doubt that many readers will be startled and deeply moved about the tragic conditions already revealed.) Although our explanations and proofs about one important sector of man's life are truthful and obvious, we are still by no means fully acquainted with post-war Yugoslav internal circumstances, and therefore formulation of a general and final conclusion is not yet possible.

I would estimate that we discussed Yugoslav economic policy for approximately forty minutes. It is realized that this time was altogether too short; nevertheless, these few moments did permit a rather extensive survey of the more important aspects of the economic problems which have confronted the Yugoslav Government since 1945 and the measures that have been utilized to rehabilitate its national economy. Following this discussion our conference continued, and the next important subject on my previously planned agenda was Yugoslav political activity. Our conversation is presented in the following dialogue:

Q. Mr. Goodman—I should like to state beforehand, Mr. Stanovnich, that my questions concerning Yugoslav political activity will, of necessity, be frank and to the point. This procedure is deemed advisable because it is only in this way that we can receive the desired information in the time available to us. I note with approval the fine cooperation given me in our discussion of economic problems, principles and policies, and sincerely hope that we can proceed as fluently on this subject. Your ideas in the economic realm of government were clearly stated in previous remarks, but your precise political philosophy has not yet been established. In what school of political thought are found your own personal political and governmental principles?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—*You, as idealistic Americans, will most probably be shocked when I say that I am a communist and thoroughly acquiesce with Marxian political principles*

and policies. Because of unfavorable and often times false American propaganda, Marxian Communism might appear to you as a brutal, totalitarian, socio-political system, but history shows that it has been *inestimably beneficial to the proletariat.* Its success has been felt the world over and, eventually, Marxian Communism will be accepted and applied by all realistic states and peoples. Many governments are already in the transitional stage.

Q. Mr. Goodman—In view of these facts, would I be correct in assuming that the philosophical basis of Yugoslav Communism is the same as that of Soviet Communism?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—In principle, yes, but in practice, no. It would be entirely accurate to say that the philosophical basis of Russian-Yugoslav Communism is identical, but application of essential Marxian principles differ.

Q. Mr. Goodman—In what way or ways does the Yugoslav Government's application of Marxian political principles differ from that of the Soviet Union?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—It is certainly a well known and recognized fact that the Yugoslav Government is most democratic *in comparison to that of the Soviet Union* (emphasis that of the author). *While we apply communistic principles in all major fields of governmental activity* it is to be especially noted that we still govern our peoples in a democratic and peaceful manner.

Q. Mr. Goodman—I think one might reasonably say that any government is, in your words, "more democratic" than that of the Soviet Union, for all the world knows the uncivilized extremist measures utilized by the Kremlin, that the Kremlin is devoid of democracy in any form. However, this analogy is by no means a concrete or conclusive one for it proves absolutely nothing. A government is either democratic or undemocratic, communistic or not communistic. A communistic government cannot be a democratic government and vice versa. Your previous remarks are, in my opinion, illogical and by no means accurate. You have stated that the Yugoslav Government accepts Marxian political principles and policies. We, as students of Sociology and Political Science, know generally the Marxian political theory. Karl Marx was a revolutionary and offered revolution as the final means to realization of a global dictatorship of the proletariat. He also advocated violent governing measures as the only means of maintaining national peace and order. Russia has practiced Marxian Communism since 1917 and all the world knows of the evils that have resulted. And now you bluntly declare

that the Yugoslav Government accepts and applies Marxian Communistic principles and policies. Then, perhaps for the sake of convenience, you state that your government is democratic in comparison to that of the Soviet Union. Isn't this a contradiction?

(His reply was sharp and definitely angered.)

A. Mr. Stanovnich—Your personal subjective conclusion might be that my remarks are contradictory! However, if you will be purely objective for a moment and forget the false, emotionally-inspired reports given you, you will then realize that my commentary is unquestionably logical. *It is certainly both understandable and conceivable that a government could accept Marxian Communistic principles and still, at the same time, democratically apply them. This is precisely the chosen position of my government.*

Q. Mr. Goodman—Although I do not wish to debate this subject with you, Mr. Stanovnich, I do feel that I must refute your statement. It is entirely impossible for a government to accept Marxian principles and at the same time democratically apply them. Marxian principles not only define specific ends to be sought by the governing group, they also include the means of achieving these ends. As I said before, the nature of these means is revolutionary, i.e. civil war, expropriation, sabotage, espionage, murder, etc. A government cannot accept Marxianism in one respect and not in another. Therefore, on this basis alone, your commentary is both illogical and inaccurate. By stating that your government accepts and applies Marxian Communism you have admitted the undemocratic nature of your government. Have you not?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—If you will honestly note my remarks you will know that I have made no such admission.

(In order to appease my attitude, he included the following words.)

I regret to say that you have been unduly prejudiced by false information, and therefore objectivity on your part is almost impossible. As an official of the Yugoslav Government you can be sure that I speak with authority as well as verity. *I sincerely hope that your false conception of my government can be favorably altered.*

(I avoided answering in accordance with my convictions, to preclude further insulting or angering the man and inviting possible abrupt dismissal. Therefore, I thought it best only to emphasize the logical consequence of his statement by indi-

cating the undemocratic character of the Yugoslav Government.)

Q. Mr. Goodman—I have noted your remarks with utmost interest and, in accordance with logic, can only conclude that you have indirectly admitted the undemocratic nature of your government.

(In order to avoid another interruption, I swiftly pursued a different point.)

Let us now discuss another aspect of the political praxis of your government. Does the Yugoslav Government permit free political elections?

(There was a brief pause before he replied.)

A. Mr. Stanovnich—Of course it does.

(Again he tried to impress us with the democratic nature of his government. His persistence became comical for it seemed to stem from some sort of a psychological guilt complex, although it is perfectly evident that communists seldom suffer from guilt.)

The democratic peoples' government in Yugoslavia has always recognized and defended the principle of free political elections. We have never deviated from this course.

Q. Mr. Goodman—In conferences with the most outstanding and reputable authorities available on internal Yugoslav conditions, I am told that free political elections do not exist in your country. In general, my informants state that only one candidate is permitted to run for political office and that when election day arrives armed state agents (UDBA—Communist Secret Police) guard the polls and force the people to re-elect Marshal Tito. The people are first threatened and then forced to vote for the government already in power. If they refuse to do this, I am told that they are tortured and then conveniently liquidated. Is this true?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—*Again I find it necessary for the sake of accuracy to repeat that your informants are stupid liars suffering from prejudice and bigotry!*

(It is interesting and significant to note that all questions which cast unfavorable implications and in any way embarrassed the Yugoslav Government's representative were immediately avoided and always severely attacked . Whenever the word "informants" was mentioned, Mr. Stanovnich would angrily denounce them in harsh and unkind phrases such as the one above.)

Regardless of information to the contrary, I restate the fact

that our government practices free political elections. Beyond this I must necessarily refuse to make further comment.

(One can readily see why Mr. Stanovnich could not make further comment. Without the slightest provocation, he furiously denounced my sources and refused to clarify his government's position on this very important point. In addition to this he became disturbed, provoked, and nervous, and his face reddened. On the basis of his statements as well as his external manifestations of complete guilt, we can safely conclude that he was embarrassed and not prepared to offer a diplomatic clarification, even though it would have been a deceptive device.)

Q. Mr. Goodman—Permit me to ask one additional question, Mr. Stanovnich. Is it true that armed state agents are present at all public elections?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—*Yes, this is true. We must always be prepared to handle any unforeseen problem. Enemies of the state deliberately try to cause disturbances at election time and we must therefore be prepared to meet the situation whenever it arises. This is also true in your country.*

(It is true that elections within the continental United States are observed by designated officials. These officials are not armed, however, and in no way attempt to influence the vote of individuals. This procedure is provided for by law.

In our discussion of pertinent Yugoslav economic problems, Mr. Stanovnich happily declared that seventy to eighty per cent of his people support the Tito Government. Now he says that 'enemies of the state' are so numerous as to make major threats to the peace on election day—so numerous, in **fact, that Yugoslav election officials must be heavily armed** in order to prevent 'disturbances.' We may reasonably ask: "Why do such disturbances occur on election day?" Because that is the opportune moment for the people to express their hostility and opposition to their unwanted communist leaders. Their expressions of unhappiness and discontent are, however, silenced at the polls by armed state agents, and Mr. Stanovnich, although innocently, corroborated this fact—*another indication that the majority of Yugoslav peoples do not support the present regime.*

What is the second reason for the arming of Yugoslav election officials?

Their purpose is obviously not to observe the conduct of elections but rather to impose fear as well as force upon the

voters. In this manner it is inevitable that most ballots will be placed in Tito's box, for who wants to be liquidated in **communist style?)**

Mr. Goodman—Thank you most sincerely for your information, Mr. Stanovnich. Now let us briefly pursue another field.

Author's Commentary

Before continuing with the text of our dialogue, I would like to include a few of my personal reflections on Mr. Stanovnich's statements about present political conditions in Yugoslavia.

In the course of our conversation, one of my very first impressions was Mr. Stanovnich's amazing intellectual instability and ignorance, his ostensible lack of a general academic education. Perhaps the same conclusion was reached by the reader for after absorbing the previous remarks of the Yugoslav representative, one can undoubtedly see how completely illogical and inaccurate were his comments. I need not remind the reader that, from an academic point of view, Mr. Stanovnich spoke so erroneously and incongruently that one could, with due justification, immediately compare him with other uneducated individuals. Why he did not use his already available powers of intellection and reason, I do not know, for he knew that my colleagues and I were advanced college students, thus possessing some fundamental academic knowledge. I would be most interested in securing information on Mr. Stanovnich's exact formal education for this would be an immeasureable help in analyzing our conference. Without such information I can only assume the following: 1) either he lacked formal education and thereby suffered from general ignorance, or 2) he spoke thus as a result of intense communistic indoctrination, which usually dissolves man's general academic principles and oftentimes makes him irrational. Consciously at least, I am inclined to believe that the latter is true.

The reader will recall this statement of Mr. Stanovnich: *"It is certainly both understandable and conceivable that a government could accept Marxian Communistic principles and still, at the same time, democratically apply them."* Partial refutation of this radical assertion was presented in my reply to Mr. Stanovnich but, for the purpose of clarity, additional comments are herein included.

Communism is against human nature and is nowhere ac-

cepted by the majority of people. To mention only one example, the riots presently taking place within the Iron Curtain countries amply document the truth of this fact. Communistic means and methods have already been discussed and, in view of these elucidations, we can see that Marxian Communistic theories are unavoidably totalitarian and that dictatorship is an actuality. The pages of contemporary history clearly reveal this fact. To deny such a widely accepted truth is folly and, in the eyes of those who are educated, bears no fruit whatsoever. And yet Mr. Stanovnich, who was perhaps a victim of lapsus memoriae, voiced before us this gross distortion of fact. As a diplomatic representative, Mr. Stanovnich should be well acquainted with world opinion, especially with Western analysis of his government. He is expected to know that competent Western statesmen consider Tito a totalitarian dictator, his government a communistic politburo. This is the precise Western analysis of Marshal Tito and his puppet regime and I sincerely expected Mr. Stanovnich to be familiar with this analysis. As a communist, however, his real duty is to dissuade foreigners, especially Americans, from negative conclusions about the Tito Government, and, in consequence, his illogical commentary was merely in the line of duty and the result of unswerving allegiance to the Communist Party of Yugoslavia of which he is, in all probability, a member. One might reasonably deduce, however, that a diplomat, usually trained in handling delicate circumstances such as this, would immediately cease illogical argumentation upon realizing that those in his company are dissatisfied with blunt undocumented assertions and generalizations. I am certain that American and Western diplomatic representatives would follow such a course for they have a clear conscience and have nothing to conceal. Stanovnich, however, apparently suffers from both afflictions. As was indicated in the preceding dialogue, I objectively refuted the above statement of Mr. Stanovnich. As a consequence of this rationally-inspired obstacle, if only for the purpose of expediency, Mr. Stanovnich should have been more concrete and academic in his reply. If, however, he would have responded thus, he would have only corroborated my firm statements—he knew that this would have been a fatal defeat for him politically as well as otherwise. Realizing this, Mr. Stanovnich chose the only possible alternative—illogical commentary. The reader will readily recognize that it is sheer arrogance for a man to repeat stubbornly before an adult, educated group, that a one-party political system like that of Yugoslavia, is a democratic system. I should not even have referred to my informants and sources to prove to Mr. Stanov-

nich the undemocratic nature of his arbitrary government, for, as was stated before, it is commonly known that the present Yugoslav form of government is a dictatorship where rule of a minority group (the Communist Party) is charged with the destiny of the majority of Yugoslav peoples. Newspapers and magazines throughout all democratic countries of the world have repeatedly recognized this fact. Regardless of Mr. Stanovnich's persistent and deligent attempts at persuasion, he could not remove this truthful fact from our minds.

Let us analyze another of Mr. Stanovnich's assertions. During our conversation on political affairs, the Yugoslav representative proudly declared that communism has been *"inestimably beneficial to the proletariat . . ."* (Refer to p. 15.) Communistic propagandizers have repeatedly announced this factor to the world ever since the early part of the twentieth century. Greater intensification of communist world-wide propaganda endeavors took place only in the years following the second world war, and now we are constantly reminded that communist states are a "workers' paradise," a glorious habitat where the laborer is unexploited, unsuppressed, uncoerced, and has the material luxuries and pleasures of life conveniently at his disposal. Words such as these are obviously meaningless and certainly unimpressive, however, for they are merely used to deceive and seduce the average man into believing something that is absolutely untrue. Exactly what does history show about application of Marxian Communism?

It is commonly known that the conditions of the average workingman in a communist state are certainly unfavorable, that his human dignity is victimized by exploitation, suppression, intimidation, and coercion. For example, in communized Soviet Russia there is greater enslavement of workers and peasants than in any contemporary capitalistic country. Those who are capable of rendering physical services to the state are savagely utilized in the following way: they are told that state employment is mandatory (if potential workers do not heed this state admonition they are cruelly disposed of) and then further told what caliber of work they will do, where their place of employment will be, and what remuneration they will receive. The sick and physically disabled are of no material use to the state and their lives are therefore of no important consequence to the governing body—their eventual fate, because they are unable to work and earn a substantial living wage and because they receive no social benefits from the state, is starvation.

So far we can readily see that there is no "workers' paradise" there or in any other communist state, which of course includes Yugoslavia. Man is forced to work for the state and therefore his freedom of choice is completely denied and the dictates of his commissars must be, although unwillingly, obeyed. An example of forced labor may be found in the youth camps that have been established by the government near railroads and public utilities. Here, where mixed groups are deliberately thrown together, a situation arises which is definitely harmful to the morals of youth.

When the Communists speak about "voluntary" labor, they should really say "forced" labor. Even such a comparatively favorable analyst as Mr. P. D. Ostovic admits that "Most of the voluntary labor was not voluntary but the result of moral and other pressure, particularly of fear of possible consequences in case of non-compliance."[4]

The laborer works long and tedious hours for pitifully low wages—his working conditions and general environment are inferior to capitalistic standards. It might also be noted that communist overlords do not permit unionization of their employees because such organization would prove to be a burdensome obstacle for them. If even the slightest attempt at labor organization is discovered, those responsible are immediately liquidated or permanently imprisoned, whichever the state desires. Thus, the worker's complete subservience to the state. **In the light of such incontrovertible facts as these, how can communism be *"inestimably beneficial to the proletariat?"*** To make such a ridiculous allegation is an absurdity, and Mr. Stanovnich, an official representative of the Yugoslav Government who dared to speak so irresponsibly before an informed **group of advanced students, uttered this falsehood in all sincerity.**

Again we ask the question: To whom is the communist system beneficial? To the proletariat, as Mr. Stanovnich declares? We have already proved the contrary, but if we reflect on the pages of history for a moment longer, we will also find the following: In the Soviet Union, one of the best contemporary examples of a true communist state, there are no unemployment aids. ***Penalties for absenteeism (defined as being*** *twenty minutes late for work or leaving early for lunch or loafing on the job three times in a month or four times in two* ***consecutive months) changed during the years 1938 to 1940*** *from automatic dismissal with loss of seniority rights to six*

[4]Ostovic, P. D., **The Truth About Yugoslavia**, (New York: Roy Publishers, 1952), p. 257.

months compulsory work in the same enterprise with one-quarter deduction from wages.[5] **Furthermore, in this "workers' paradise"** laborers are forbidden to abandon their jobs without permission, and the government has decreed that skilled workers and technical personnel can be moved at state will anywhere in the country. Since every worker must have a labor book, which is retained by the employer, and cannot by law take a job without one, he can move in fact only if his employer agrees or if he can find another employer who, because of the chronic labor shortage, is willing to turn a blind eye to the legality of his position. Similar severe employment circumstances can also be found in Yugoslavia.

In the background of Soviet (Communist) labor policy stands always the shadow of forced and prison labor. The actual size of these forced labor camps has been much disputed—estimates run from eight million to twenty million—but even if the smaller figure is accepted it is sufficiently high for most people in the Soviet Union to know someone who has been confined in such a camp. From their own experience, therefore, a vast number of Soviet citizens know that many who are thus imprisoned are "innocent" according to any objective moral standard. But in totalitarian countries such as Russia and Yugoslavia, mass indignation can hardly exist, let alone be expressed; reactions are likely to be a compound of fatalism, indifference, and fear. Most of the prisoners are said to be in the camps for political crimes against the state—holding unorthodox political opinions (anti-communists), resisting collectivization, belonging to nationality groups suspected by the government, participating in religious observances, and so forth. Many are there for violating unjust communist economic laws or failing to meet their production quotas. This is how the average workingman lives and works in the Soviet Union, a state which practices the identical type **of Marxian Communism as Yugoslavia. *Mr. Stanovnich indirectly praises the Russian system and boastfully tells us that Yugoslavia has the very same communistic labor policy. What a "paradise" it must be in present-day Yugoslavia!***

The Yugoslav representative's assertion about the success of communism in the world is, of course, erroneous.

We can disprove this statement by referring to the recent riots in communist East Germany, provoked by mass starvation

[5]Soviet Russia is often referred to in this dossier for the purpose of enunciating the essential similarity between her and Yugoslavia. One cannot concretely compare Communist Yugoslavia with a democratic state and therefore any analogy must include another communist state. Soviet Russia seems to be the best available example and therefore is used liberally throughout the dossier. (Carter, Ranney, and Herz, o. c. p. 555-560.)

and general state exploitation of essential human rights. Revolutionary trends are evident in many other European countries presently under communistic domination, which is indicative of the near failure of the communist system.

Also we find historical evidence which proves that none of Karl Marx's predictions have evolved into actualities. The disastrous economic crisis, supposed to develop from the accumulation of goods in the hands of a few and because of the growth of a starving labor class eager for revolution in "capitalistic" countries, has not yet occurred; the middle class (many members having come from a former proletariat status), far from disappearing into the proletariat, has become increasingly strong; and the workers, by using their power to organize in unions and cooperatives, have greatly improved their bargaining position and their material prosperity. Moreover, members of other social classes have helped in the enactment of social legislation: protection of women and children in industry, compensation for accidents, protection against dangerous machinery and unhealthful working conditions, limitations on minimum wages and maximum hours of work, and insurance against illness, unemployment, and old age. All of these humanitarian economic and social changes have come to fruition in democratic, free states where experience has shown that uncoerced hands and minds are the necessary fundaments of a prosperous economy and a harmonious, peaceful society.

After a thorough, objective analysis of the preceding information, what can we conclude about political conditions in Yugoslavia? Without any doubt whatsoever, we can honestly deduce that Yugoslavia is a police state where millions of peoples are daily subjected to countless injustices and inhumane treatment. We need not misconstrue the evidence available, for these confirmed facts clearly indicate that communism in Tito-land is the same as communism in the Russian orbit. Totalitarian brutality reigns supreme in Yugoslavia and the facts which have already been given offer concrete proof of this.

Appendix

"Tito has his tongue in his cheek when he proclaims free speech. One dare not speak even to his children freely for fear that they might inadvertently reveal some indiscreet statement to the authorities. The ears of UDBA, the Red secret police, are everywhere. Over-crowded prisons give eloquent testimony as to why people prefer to remain silent."

Andrew Diakun
Graduate of the University of Buffalo Law School
(Statement from Buffalo Evening News)

"Mother told us we'd hear beautiful music and see lovely dancing. We saw none at all—only tears and fear and more fear. When we walked into Tito's Yugoslavia, we walked into a Russia, into an Iron Curtain . . . My husband's nephew has been in Lepoglava Prison for two years for listening to the Paris radio . . . If the gates were opened in Yugoslavia only Tito would be left. The people hate communism, especially in Croatia. Their only hope is that America some day will save them. They warned us to be vigilant—they didn't think it could happen there, either."

Mrs. Andrew T. Serbach
(Statement from Buffalo Evening News)

"I could fill every page in today's issue of the Buffalo Evening News with details of incidents that occurred during our seven weeks there . . . We bumped into an Iron Curtain in Yugoslavia . . . On our way to the village of Krasic to visit His Eminence, Aloysius Cardinal Stepinac, we were stopped, our passports demanded, examined, recorded and returned by the militia, who were armed with rifles and hand grenades. On our return we went through the same procedure."

Mrs. Erwin E. Bunn
(Statement from Buffalo Evening News)

"Besides the always active Croat nationalist movement, trouble is in the making for Tito in Macedonia. Bulgarian propaganda is having effect, and a Macedonian movement for union with Bulgaria is gaining strength."

(Intelligence Digest, January, 1951, p. 24.)

"In Croatia, Communist officials are so ostracized and isolated that they could not be induced to serve except by being given very special advantages . . . Communist officials and local party groups have been ordered to intensify their activities against the opposition, whose growing importance is openly admitted. The enemies of the Government are listed as Cominform agents, the right wing reactionaries, farmers opposing collectivization, the Ustachi movement, the Cetniks, and the clergy."

(Intelligence Digest, January, 1951, p. 24.)

CHAPTER III

Religious Persecution

The existence of an Almighty is known and accepted by all men of right reason. History's greatest scholars philosophically proved the existence of God many centuries ago and this principle has now become a sacred truth for millions and millions of civilized peoples the world over. Mankind's unswerving faith in and loyalty to God has solved countless individual, state, and international problems, until today there is no general doubt or question about His existence. His glorious Kingdom, His sacred teachings, and His sovereignty over us all are exalted beliefs. Men of sound reason and noble spirit have never attempted to deny this faith; but a selfish ideology of the twentieth century now proclaims itself the molder of man's destiny and the saviour of the material possessions of the world's populace, while it at the same time denounces God and the divine plan exemplified in human nature (natural moral law). Marxian Communism is discreetly heralded by Mr. Stanovnich and the entire Yugoslav Government. Those who have allied themselves with its despicable and depraved principles have become socio-political fanatics of unfortunate and lamentable consequence.

One of the major objectives of this ideology, aspired to by Yugoslav officialdom, is the destruction of religion and the annihilation of ministers of all faiths. This goal is gradually approaching realization in Yugoslavia today where there is a genuine, calculated effort by Marshal Tito and his civil administrators to destroy once and for all time religious activity within the Yugoslav state.

Heretofore our conference had brought to light several economic, social and political ideals and realities of the present Yugoslav Communist Government. Our discussion of philosophy proved timely for it surfaced many of Mr. Stanovnich's real convictions on religious matters. The dialogue follows:

Q. Mr. Beveridge—It is a common opinion, Mr. Stanovnich, that one who accepts the principles of Marxian Communism, as you do, is a materialist. Am I correct in assuming that you can be considered no exception to this general opinion?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—No, you most certainly are not. I do not now nor have I ever accepted materialistic philosophy. Most Americans and Western peoples think that we communists are materialists because they have been presented with such false information and malicious distortions of fact in their respective educational processes.

Q. Mr. Beveridge—It is obvious then, Mr. Stanovnich, that if you are not a materialist that you are an immaterialist.

A. Mr. Stanovnich—I do not know why you insist that I am an immaterialist as a necessary consequent of my statement that I am not a materialist. Please be assured that I am neither of the two. I am a realist, an objectivist.

Q. Mr. Beveridge—I am not at all certain that I know exactly what you mean by the words 'realist' and 'objectivist,' Mr. Stanovnich. Would you kindly explain your terms?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—*By realist I merely mean that I, as well as my colleagues, recognize reality as the only element of genuine importance to man. We are not impressed or moved by what you would call metaphysical truths. In my modest opinion immaterialistic philosophy is an unnecessary excursion into the unknown, into an infinity that can never be known or completely understood by man because he has no supersensual powers and, consequently, has severe limitations. We prefer, therefore, to utilize our minds in the only logical way. We accept as fact only what we can see, feel, touch, weigh, measure, and so forth. If we follow this course we can formulate firm, factual convictions and truths. If, however, we become spiritualists, which often is the result of environmental indoctrination and not intellectual rationalization, we begin a fruitless exploration of the 'supernatural,' if there is such a thing. We become engrossed in fictional things and beings whose actual existence cannot be proven. Then man is completely lost in a trail of darkness. We, on the other hand, objectively pursue life's pathway and always adhere to the boundaries of our capabilities. With a philosophy such as this we are less prone to erroneous conclusions.*

Q. Mr. Goodman—I would like to interrupt for a moment, gentlemen, and ask an important question that has been overlooked thus far. You mentioned, Mr. Stanovnich, man's ability to rationalize and reason. Is it not logical to assume that these intellective powers have a direct cause?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—There may be one of two answers to that question, Mr. Goodman. The nature of man's intellective capacities and capabilities might be spiritual, although there is no concrete proof of this. Contrariwise, these intellective qualities might have been accidental or even evolutionary endowments. There is also no concrete proof of this, although evidence points more in this direction. Therefore, you can see that the only safe conclusion is uncertainty.

Q. Mr. Goodman—I cannot concur with this thesis, Mr. Stanovnich, for it appears fatalistic to me. It minimizes man's intelligence. You have already stated that man possesses specific intellective powers. Obviously, then, he is expected to use these faculties in all human endeavor. Do you agree with me thus far?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—Yes, I do.

Q. Mr. Goodman—When we use our immaterial faculties of intellection and reason, supplemented by all available historical and scientific facts, we are able to arrive at certain basic, fundamental conclusions. **Do you concur?**

A. Mr. Stanovnich—Yes, although I do not agree that intellection and reason are immaterial faculties. Please go on.

Q. Mr. Goodman—These conclusions are then repeatedly examined and reexamined. If we are not then certain, further experimentation is conducted. *Our final conclusion then becomes an acceptable principle or truth, whichever you wish to call it. Do you agree?*

A. Mr. Stanovnich—Certainly.

Q. Mr. Goodman—Having accepted my statements thus far, you must then necessarily agree that man is also capable of investigating 'supernatural' problems.

A. Mr. Stanovnich—I will agree only to a certain point. Man is capable of investigating 'supernatural' problems and therefrom making certain conclusions. He is not, however, empowered to proclaim these conclusions as being truths or facts.

Q. Mr. Goodman—You seem to contradict your own statements, Mr. Stanovnich. You asserted only a few moments ago that man is capable of scientific investigation and of making certain conclusions as a consequence of this investigation. Why can't the same principle be applied to research in the 'supernatural' field?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—Because man has nothing concrete to work with in this field. True, he can make assertions, but of what academic value are assertions?

Q. Mr. Goodman—Man first has the physical world to work with and can readily perceive the amazing accomplishments of past civilizations. We can see things that man himself is absolutely incapable of creating. Logically, therefore, there is a cause for all these wonderments, a cause far superior to anything physical. We call that cause, God. How can you possibly object to such reasoning?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—*The accomplishments and wonderments about which you speak are, according to all physical evidence, created and produced by man himself. There is absolutely nothing which proves the contrary.* On that basis alone, I cannot accept your reasoning.

Q. Mr. Beveridge—It seems evident, Mr. Stanovnich, that you do not care to commit yourself in this particular discussion for you have evaded concrete replies ever since the first question was asked. First you denied being a materialist, and then, in the process of explaining what you meant by 'realist,' you presented an excellent explanation of what academic circles call materialism. There is no question in my mind that you are a materialist for your previous remarks do not indicate otherwise. What I would like to ask at this point is the most important question in any discussion of a religious nature. *Do you believe that God as an individual, spiritual person exists?*

A. Mr. Stanovnich—*We, as communists, are, according to your words, materialists. In actuality, however, we are merely objectivists and realists. We believe that matter came first and is therefore of utmost importance, and that spiritual values were later invented by man. For us, the physical world commands the greatest attention and concern because it is the only reality that we are capable of perceiving. Spiritual innovations of man are not realistic and are therefore of little importance. Therefore, I personally believe in no God.*

Q. Mr. Goodman—Taking cognizance of the fact that you do not believe in God and also realizing that official members of the Yugoslav Government and the Communist Party disavow religious worship in any form, I am well aware of the precarious state of all Christian faiths in your country. You will recall that the leader of the Roman Catholic Church in Yugoslavia, Aloysius Cardinal Stepinac, was sentenced to sixteen years imprisonment by your government for his alleged 'traitorous and terroristic activities' and for being an 'enemy of the state and the peoples authority.' You will also remember that sharp and scathing protests emanated from the majority of the countries in the world denouncing Tito for his unjust and inhumane conduct toward the Cardinal. I, as well as millions of others, am convinced that his trial was a mockery, that the charges brought against him were false, and that his conviction and sentence was planned by communist conspirators long before the trial even began. What are your comments on this subject, Mr. Stanovnich?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—We have adequate proof that Cardinal

Stepinac was a traitor and guilty of mass terrorism in the highest degree. He fought against his own people in the last war. As would be done in any other country, including your own, he was brought to trial and democratically given every opportunity to explain his case. Numerous witnesses revealed to the court his traitorous plot against the state and the people. We only fulfilled our peoples' trust by convicting this criminal and placing him in a place of confinement where terrorism could not be committed.

Q. Mr. Goodman—It is true that a traitor must be properly punished but there is no doubt as to the Cardinal's innocence. Communistic governments have always made a habit of liquidating religious leaders in their state. Hungarian officials ridded themselves of Cardinal Mindszenty in the same manner as you did Cardinal Stepinac. The charges brought against both were undocumented and bitterly protested by the overwhelming majority of peoples in the respective states. In the opinion of leading world statesmen, the conviction of Cardinals Stepinac and Mindszenty were typical communist-inspired religious purges.

A. Mr. Stanovnich—You speak irresponsibly, Mr. Goodman! Cardinal Stepinac was allied with Hitler and the entire Nazi clique in the last war. He plotted against the Yugoslav state and peoples and was therefore guilty of high treason. He fought against his own people and conducted terrorisms of great severity. Stepinac is a criminal, an enemy of the state, and a ruthless despot. In spite of all this we were merciful in sentencing him to only sixteen years of imprisonment. In many other countries he would have been immediately executed. Even now this criminal is well treated.

Q. Mr. Goodman—I might also say that you speak irresponsibly, Mr. Stanovnich. You call Cardinal Stepinac many despicable names but have absolutely no concrete documentation or corroboration for such serious allegations. I dare to say that I have more proof of the Cardinal's innocence than you do for his guilt. We could confer for many additional hours, however, and you would stubbornly pursue these illogical as well as unjust accusations. Because of this I would like to discuss another point. Why did the Yugoslav Government sever diplomatic relations with the Vatican when the Pope designated Stepinac a Cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—The answer to that question should be obvious to you, Mr. Goodman. Again, Stepinac is a criminal and a traitor, and was so convicted. His elevation to a Cardinalship by the Vatican was therefore a gross insult to our peoples. We had no recourse other than severence of diplomatic relations.

Q. Mr. Goodman—Your government's action was therefore merely a protestation against the Pope's action.

(I was then interrupted.)

A. Mr. Stanovnich—That was only one of many reasons. Another is that the Vatican is merely an instrument of imperialistic Italian foreign policy. We do not care to engage in business with such tyrants.

Q. Mr. Goodman—Would you have permitted Stepinac to go to these 'tyrants' in Rome to be formally elevated to the Cardinalate?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—Out of kindness and mercy, our government offered this privilege to Stepinac, but he stubbornly refused. He is always trying to make himself a martyr.

Q. Mr. Goodman—Would you have permitted the Cardinal's re-entry into Yugoslavia had he chosen to go to Rome?

A. Mr. Stanovnich—*We most certainly would not have permitted such a foolish thing as that! It would be unthinkable to permit the re-entry of such a ruthless despot as he! No government would pursue such an unjust policy!*

Mr. Goodman—There are two comments that must be introduced at this point. First of all, if a government were completely certain that a man were a traitor and a criminal, as you say the Cardinal is, it would not permit that same man to leave the country under any circumstance. The mere fact that your government willingly granted the Cardinal permission to go to Rome indicates that his conviction was a religious purge, that his confinement was the only conceivable momentary way of preventing him from conducting his religious duties and functions. Secondly, your government saw a better way of permanently eliminating the Cardinal by permitting him to go to Rome and then denying him re-entry into Yugoslavia. This is another documentation of your previous statement that any means, even the most unjust, can be used to achieve a specific state objective.

Our reflections on the status of religion in Yugoslavia have been quite sufficient. It is now perfectly obvious why national religious crimes have occurred in your state since 1945, and the fundamental cause of Cardinal Stepinac's imprisonment has, although indirectly, been established.

Author's Commentary

Although there are minority groups (of a socio-political nature) in the world that profess no religion at all, these groups are usually composed of extreme positivists who, in their quest for personal material gain, i.e. wealth, power, social preeminence etc., disregard natural law and selfishly, often by cruel, despotic means, pursue their individual objectives and goals. These groups, whose members differ in personality and capabilities, all adhere to a common materialistic philosophy, pragmatism and positivism.

The progress of materialism in its more modern dress began in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It has gained wide acceptance as an integral part of Marxian Communism. We are not surprised, therefore, at Mr. Stanovnich's actual acceptance of materialism, his emphasis upon only the physical aspects of life, and his complete denial of metaphysical and supernatural realities.

Our first question was designed to secure admission of this very fact from Mr. Stanovnich. As the reader will remember, Mr. Stanovnich made this reply: "I do not now nor have I ever accepted materialistic philosophy." If the Counselor had held to a non-materialistic personal philosophy in his succeeding commentaries, he could have been considered a somewhat logical man. Instead of this, he maintained in subsequent remarks the exact philosophy that he had only a few moments ago denied, again indicating his lack of logic. In stating that "I am a realist," Mr. Stanovnich wished to exonerate his own materialism and, at the same time, denounce immaterialism, although this statement was also a non-committal device. His explanation of 'realism' (refer to p. 27) served ample notice that materialism and realism are, at least in his opinion, merely correlative words having identical meaning. His comments only corroborated the fact that he is a materialist and that materialism is the philosophical basis of communism. We know beyond any doubt that a dedicated and convinced communist is also a materialist. He preferred the word 'realism' to materialism because he is aware of the unfavorable implications resulting from an admission of a materialistic philosophy. He therefore chose to deceive us into believing that 'realism' and 'materialism,' as he advocates them, are completely different ideologies.

Another gross semantic misrepresentation was introduced by the Yugoslav representative in his use of 'supernatural.' According to Mr. Stanovnich, 'supernatural' means anything above physical reality, anything that is not readily perceivable

by the senses. He states that man is capable of understanding, although with difficulty, only physical phenomena and that any operations above that specific plane are absolutely and forever devoid of human comprehension. His opinions and statements on these matters can only lead to one conclusion. Mr. Stanovnich expresses absolute and sincere doubt about our capacity to ascertain any knowledge whatsoever of metaphysical and supernatural reality.[6] This indicates that he is, from a philosophical point of view, a skeptic and agnostic (the father of modern Agnosticism is Emmanuel Kant). The logical and inevitable consequence of the agnosticism, empiricism, and positivism which is subtly introduced in the Counselor's ambiguous terminology is an unobstructed path to a materialistic aspect on life. It merely means that Mr. Stanovnich does not accept or believe in the existence of God, moral law, man's last end in the achievement of God as the Highest Good, salvation, and supernatural life. That is the grave tragedy of the majority of modern systems which consistently deny metaphysics, and thus inevitably lead to a materialistic philosophy. The possibility of obtaining knowledge of the existence of God, natural law, etc. is the basis of Christianity and all Christian religions. Mr. Stanovnich directly denied the fundaments of all monotheistic and Christian religions. In denouncing these religious fundamentals, he clearly revealed his own personal belief in agnosticism and materialism.

Christian leaders know that religious worship, of immeasurable importance to the humble, sincere, and self-sacrificing faithful who wish to one day come to that happy End, the attainment of their Highest Good in God, suffers incredible persecution throughout Yugoslavia. The essential human right to freedom of religion is not recognized by Marshal Tito, and he has used every possible device to liquidate his greatest opponent and obstacle, the Church. In the early part of his regime he declared atheism the official government philosophy. This same edict was his subtle way of serving notification to his peoples that future religious worship would not be tolerated while he was dictator. This momentous order, which was designed to destroy freedom of religion, was ineffective. Embittered, Tito then decided to exemplify to the people his complete control over all aspects of individual and collective activity within Yugoslavia. Determined more than ever to realize the destruction of all Christian faiths, Marshal Tito inaugurated a new state policy towards religion. Although

[6]The same point of view is expressed by all Marxian philosophers, as for example George Plekhanov, **The Materialist Conception of History**, (N. Y. International Publishers: 1940) p. 35.

the plan was not publicly released but remained subterranean, its horrible results were experienced by millions of innocent Yugoslav peoples. A savage liquidation of religious leaders began, and the blood of courageous servants of God flowed promiscuously across the land. Scores of priests were charged with fictitious crimes and imprisoned or executed by UDBA. Churches were confiscated and religious communities (convents, parishes, etc.) were looted and illegally transferred to state ownership and authority. Religious instruction in public schools was forbidden by executive order, and all Catholic schools were immediately closed. Not even in the churches that remained was religious instruction permissible! Civil marriage became mandatory—no longer could a prospective married couple have a choice between civil and religious marriage ceremonies. Commemoration of holy days was officially banned and notification of such days was ordered to be permanently erased from all calendars. Despite all scientific evidence to the contrary, Tito proclaimed Darwinism the official state dogma. Numerous other exploitations, brutalities, cruelties, and indignities were and are committed to destroy religion by armed, brute force. Sad as it is, these same annihilative policies are in affect today in Yugoslavia. Let us briefly analyze the hardships and sufferings that have resulted.

Although all Christian faiths have mutually shared Tito's religious inhumaneness, it must be pointed out that the Catholic Church has been, relatively, the greatest victim of persecution in Yugoslavia, and has been stripped of more of its cherished and sacred possessions and valued leaders than has other faiths. It must be remembered, however, that in Yugoslavia there are about seven million Catholics out of a total population of sixteen million people and the Catholic Church is, therefore, of obvious high concern to the government. The basis of Tito's past and present particular severity towards the Catholic clergymen and laity is his hatred of God and Christianity, and his fanatical dedication to the Marxian ideology, where religion is the opium of the people and a means of keeping large masses under 'capitalistic dictatorship.' If we have any compassion for our fellow man at all, our Western Governments would denounce Tito for his religious persecutions and crimes and formulate constructive recommendations for submittal to the proper agencies of the United Nations in an effort to defend the Yugoslav peoples from Tito's unprovoked violation of the UN Charter on Human Rights. None of us can really appreciate the gravity of religious circumstances in Yugoslavia, but we can neverthe-

less realize its importance by reviewing exclusive documented reports on the subject. To tell the whole story of the violent and fierce persecution of Christians in general and the clergy in particular since Tito came to power would take not one, but several large dossiers. However, some excerpts from significant reports are herein included:

"A great number of priests languish in various concentration camps, doomed to long years of forced labor. To this day the Greek-Catholic Bishop, Dr. Janko Simrak, is deprived of his freedom, and the fate of Bishop Carevic is unknown to us. In the humanly uninhabitable concentration camps, many priests are made to perform duties degrading to their sacerdotal dignity. Though it could be, yet often times they are not allowed to hear Mass on Sunday—much less to say Mass—thus depriving the priests and other internees of great spiritual comfort and benefit. Their crime—political views variant with that of their accusers. Many of these interned priests, who were seized by government agents, we know not to this day where they are. All our appeals, all our searchings are in vain. All traces have been erased . . . The press openly attacks the clergy which can defend itself in no way, since the laws allow such attacks and the papers tolerate no rebuttal whatsoever . . . The graves of the dead are not spared or left unmolested. In the cemeteries of Zagreb, Varazdin, and elsewhere, the government has ordered that the crosses be stripped from the graves of Ustashi and German graves. These graves have been so vandallized that there is no way of telling who is buried there. Such procedure must be condemned and censured. Before death all men must bow. In death all men cease to be enemies. The unwritten law of human decency, springing from Christian love, gives to all men the right of decent burial. It is well known that after the first World War the graves of the one-time enemy were honored and guarded. Today, our own sons are denied this in their own land . . . It is abundantly evident and clearly to be seen that the Catholic Church in Democratic Federative Yugoslavia is in more difficult circumstances than hithertofore (worse than under Nazi rule)."

Joint Pastoral Letter of the Bishops of the
Federal National Republic of Yugoslavia
(Issued on September 20, 1945.)

* * *

"Utter terror reigns all over the country. Catholic men and women disappear in the dead of the night, and their families cannot find out where they have been taken. Most of them never return; the others come back, broken and silent. But if they talk of their experiences, they disappear again—this time for good.

More than 2,000 Catholic intellectuals are interned in the concentration camp at Lepoglava, and it is to be feared that most of them will never leave it alive.

The walls of the houses all over the country are covered with one slogan painted by Communists: "Death to the Priests!" Many priests have been frequently told by Communists: "It would be a pleasure to me to kill you, but the Party thinks the time has not yet come."

Priests and nuns are interned in the dreaded concentration camp at Stara Gradishka, where they have to suffer bestial tortures which are beyond all description and comparable only to those at the notorious Belsen.

Very few of the military chaplains in the Army of the Independent

State of Croatia are still alive. All the others, accused of having been "officers in the army of opposition during the occupation," have been killed.

Savage outrages, often beyond description, have been committed against the dead. The bodies of some of the priests who had been murdered by Communists were hacked to pieces and thrown into the sea. The graves of only a very few of the victims are known.

The graves of German and Italian soldiers and of Yugoslav civilians murdered by Communists have been levelled and the crosses over them destroyed. Everyone of the Archbishops and Bishops in Yugoslavia has been arrested by OZNA and held in prison, some of them for only a few hours, others for several days or weeks. Since their release they have been subject to such rigorous surveillance by OZNA that they are virtual prisoners in their residences . . ."

Anthony H. Count O'Brien of Thomond, Ph.D., L.L.D., Pol. Sc. D. (hon.)
Statement from his book **"Archbishop Stepinac—The Man and His Case,"** (The Newman Bookshop, Westminster, Maryland, 1947), pp. 39-40.

* * *

"Roadside crosses and paintings have been destroyed, but the perpetrators of these violations can never be discovered. The same thing has happened to some of the smaller chapels in Slovenia and in other parts of the country. The large and beautiful Church of the Holy Redeemer at Rijeka was mined overnight and destroyed at the beginning of November, 1949, although it stood in the very center of the town. The Church of the Carmelite Sisters at Selo, Ljubljana, was destroyed and without any reason the beautiful chapel Salita al Calvario, on the island of Krk, was demolished. As far as we know, in the same way many Catholic churches in Banat have been destroyed, while, in different parts of the country, many public oratories, in the former institutions of the nuns, have been closed down by force. The UDBA authorities require organists, both men and women, and masters of ecclesiastical chant, to leave their duties. Processions are, in most parts of the country, forbidden, and the bigger religious celebrations where the faithful from several parishes assemble, are frequently obstructed in various ways. In particular the celebration of the so-called first Mass is obstructed. The hostility of the authorities goes so far as to take away from the young priest also the gifts in natura, which he used to be given by the faithful on this occasion, according to ancient custom. The freedom of preaching is also endangered. Priests are sometimes cited for responsibility because in quotations of Holy Scripture or in positive explanations of religious truths are seen actions against the State and the existing social order. The State has even gone so far as to forbid priests to oppose atheistic propaganda amongst children. "Priests," so it is written in an instruction of the internal section of the National District Committee in Bosnia and Herzegovina, "are not allowed to influence the parents, lest their children should not become atheists." From another priest it was required that in his sermons he should persuade the faithful not to go to church. Priests are not allowed to give religious instruction in schools, presbyteries and other ecclesiastical premises: there are many cases where priests were prohibited from giving instruction to the youth in the churches themselves, even such as the preparation for first Holy Communion or Confirmation. The priests, because of the breach of such prohibitions, are cited and punished by fine or arrest. The Church and her institutions are overcharged by disproportionately high taxes, and when the priests are not able to pay

them they are distrained and deprived of their belongings, or the goods of the presbyteries are seized. Many churches are not allowed in any way to collect ecclesiastical alms. The Cathedral at Ljubljana had to pay 10,000 dinars fine, because its sacristan removed 10 dinars from the altar: an offering which had been left there by one of the faithful.

The arrest of priests goes on, and the punishments received by them exceed in severity the already rigorous standards which are generally applied to our legal practice. For example, Karlo Gnidovec, the seventy-five-year-old and much respected parish priest and dean of Zuzemberk, was, a few days ago, sentenced to death by shooting for acts supposedly committed during the war.

There are still in Yugoslav State prisons more than two hundred priests, and one can say with a clear conscience that during the last eight years a considerable part of the Catholic clergy have experienced, for longer or shorter periods, the disgrace and hardships of the prisons.

Physical attacks on the priests are not rare. During the last seven years about eighty priests have been killed by ambush, secretly and in the majority of these cases the perpetrators have not been discovered and punished. This ferocity reached its climax in the attack on the person of Monsignor Anton Vovk, Bishop of Ljubljana, while he was officially travelling. On January 20th, 1952, he was physically attacked at the railway station at Novo Mesto: petrol was poured on him and ignited. But for his presence of mind he would have been burnt alive. Here is the strangest thing: the attacker was only condemned to nine days' conditional jail for his crime! There is, finally, the very painful question of the official atheistic course in the schools and in the whole public life of the F. N. R. Y. Atheism is the religion of the regime. Atheism is taught in the schools, preached in the conferences, propagated in the press, enforced on employees and on the Army. Teachers in the elementary and middle schools are formally forbidden to frequent the churches. Teachers who do not obey this command are dismissed from their posts. In a state employee religiousness is considered as the worst possible characteristic. Officers of the Yugoslav Army dare not even think of getting their children baptised.

The Catholic Press is completely destroyed. The whole of the Catholic school in the territory of the F. N. R. Y. has been liquidated."

Letter of the Yugoslav Bishops to Marshal Tito
(September, 1952.)

Numerous other noteworthy documents revealing Yugoslav Communist religious atrocities could be cited. However, the above quotations sufficiently denote the deplorable message that I wish to convey. It is well to note that these reports are dated 1945, 1947 and 1952 respectively, which indicates that, despite Tito's recent announcements of state leniency and dispensation of obstructive techniques towards religious worship, persecution and crimes are presently pursued with unrestricted and uninhibited persistence. The above unadulterated testimony is from honest, sincere and God-fearing patriots of Yugoslavia and therefore is accurate and truthful. The grim facts that have been presented should make the leaders and citizens of the Western World rise in protest if they remain loyal to their heritage and sacred institutions. Such an

unprovoked and flagrant violation of the United Nations' Charter on Human Rights should be met with united and concerted protestation and action.

As was pointed out in the dialogue, Aloysius Cardinal Stepinac, the head of the Roman Catholic Church in Yugoslavia, has been a state prisoner for seven gruelling years. The long imprisonment, inhuman deprivation and suffering that he has endured by order of Marshal Tito has made him a very ill man. (Only a few weeks ago two American medical specialists, with U. S. Department of State authorization, flew to the ailing Cardinal's bedside.) His vigilance, Christian love of his people, and his loyalty to the cause of humanity remains foremost and unhindered in his thoughts. Why is this great man (often called a Saint) imprisoned at this hour? Because he resisted the Communist Party and its misdeeds in the same way as he had resisted the Nazis and protested against the Ustasha regime during World War II. Even after the Communist Government assumed a relatively absolute political dictatorship, the Cardinal fearlessly attacked its slaughtering of Yugoslav citizenry, its edicts denying freedom and liberty to his beloved people, its general massacres and murderous activities. He denounced Tito for the inexplicable agony he imposed upon millions of the populace. The Cardinal's hostility, borne of pure brotherly love and heroic charity, became unbearable for the Marshal. The Cardinal was then summarily arrested on false charges and sentenced to sixteen years of imprisonment without, of course, a democratic trial. Today he is held a state prisoner and is under constant UDBA surveillance. Imagine a man being held a victim of communist brutality just because he courageously defended the human rights of his own Croatian people! But so is communism in the twentieth century wherever it is practiced, whether in Russia or Yugoslavia. To resist the movement is to surrender your freedom, or more often your life. Tito, a Communist dictator, has crushed the souls and bodies of men. He has degraded free men to the level of slaves. For that we can be sure that one day he will receive the punishment due him.

Appendix

"Tito is an enemy of and . . . a persecutor of the church. Certainly, therefore, we must protest as and where we can against the attack on religion in Yugoslavia, and mobilize national and international opinion against it. It is our duty and interest to press for our rights . . . Yugoslavia remains a Communist, one party, police state."

Michael P. Fogarty
(Commonweal, April 10, 1953, p. 18.)

"Marshal Tito has hypocritically proclaimed religious freedom. The churches are full, but only because the people are traditionally devout and God-fearing. Their attendance at services is a passive demonstration of their opposition to the regime's officially proclaimed Godlessness. However, teachers, public servants, and professional people are absent from church services, since their attendance would be a ground for immediate dismissal from their position.

Many parishes are without pastors since scores of clergymen are in Communist forced-labor camps and many hundreds are dead. Church lands, which formerly supported such institutions as hospitals, schools and orphanages, have been confiscated. Impossible tax burdens have been imposed upon remaining church properties.

Collections during services and contributions of all sorts have been forbidden. Religious education of children, either at home or in church, is a punishable offense.

Atheism is part of the curriculum of all schools. Yugoslavia's new god is Tito, whose portrait hangs from every shop window and is emblazoned in electric lights above the streets of every city and village in Yugoslavia. Unfortunate Yugoslavia has exchanged the occupying storm trooper's 'Heil Hitler' for Red Facism's 'Zivio Tito.'

The masses would welcome an overthrow of the present regime, but Tito's new alliance with the West has added new weight to their chains and liberation now seems a dream difficult, if not impossible, of attainment."

Andrew Diakun
Graduate of the University of Buffalo Law School
(Statement from Buffalo Evening News)

* * *

"They (400 nuns in Zagreb, Croatia, Yugoslavia) can't teach or do hospital work unless they discard the habits they have vowed to wear. Their only food comes from a small garden, and the last two summers have been dry."

Mrs. Andrew T. Serbach
(Statement from Buffalo Evening News)

* * *

"On a pilgrimage to the Shrine of the Blessed Mother at Bistrica, the militia stopped our cab and demanded that we return to Zagreb. We pretended to leave but later returned by another route and walked. The water in this village of Bistrica was shut off, the hotels were filled with militia so that thirsty pilgrims would not be able to find lodgings or buy wine. The street leading to the shrine was covered with large stones for a quarter of a mile; a barricade was put up so that the worshippers could not march abreast and sing their sacred hymns. Anyone giving a pilgrim lodging for the night was threatened with a 5,000 dinar fine. The children were put up in a barn at the rectory cared for by the few nuns left in Yugoslavia.

The peasants slept on the church floor, for the first time in history, as they were not allowed to sleep in the fields or on private lawns. Since infancy my mother told me lovely stories about worshipping at this shrine. What a let down! I was not allowed even to mail religious cards."

Mrs. Erwin E. Bunn
(Statement from Buffalo Evening News)

"In Zagreb, the Communists entered the cathedral and smashed the statue of Our Lady of Bistrica. Soldiers are forbidden to enter a church. All Catholic schools are closed and the buildings confiscated. Convents and religious homes have been confiscated. Religious books in the churches were burned. The graves of soldiers of World War II have been leveled and destroyed. In a concentration camp in Lepoglava, 2,100 Catholic intellectuals are imprisoned."

Dr. Anthony Butkovich

(The above information, as well as abundant reports on similar communist persecutions, was introduced by Congressman William E. McVey of Illinois to the House of Representatives on Thursday, April 16, 1953. The material was inscribed in the Congressional Record.)

"Tito has no intention of making a genuine gesture of peace and toleration towards the Church. He is irreconcilably and violently anti-religious . . . Religious persecution continues unabated. Atheism is taught in the national schools. In the country areas, services are regularly attended by the secret police. Hardly a Sunday passes on which some priest is not arrested for preaching doctrines repugnant to Communism. Just as in the Cominform countries, efforts are being made to set up a dissident Catholic Church, loyal to the regime. Apostate priests have already been chosen as its leaders."

(Intelligence Digest, January, 1951, p. 24.)

Three essential charges were levied against Cardinal Stepinac at his 1946 trial. They were: the forceful conversion of Serbs into the Catholic faith, his position as Military Ordinary of the Croatian National Army, and his being an enemy of the state (really the Communists) and the people's authority. The Cardinal's refutation to these accusations is briefly presented in selected quotations taken from the speech given at his trial:

"The guilt for the re-baptism of Serbs is ascribed to me . . . It is a fact that I was obliged to remove pastors, for they stood in danger of death from the Orthodox. The Serbs wanted to kill these priests because they refused them admission into the Church. (It is a fact that during the war the Church had to find its way through countless difficulties. There was a desire to aid as far as it was at all possible the Serbian people . . .)

Because I was the Military Ordinary, grave criminality is imputed to me. I was the M. O. in the former Yugoslavia. I labored during these eight to nine years to bring about a definite solution of the religious problem. This question was finally solved through the Yugoslav Concordat, which was agreed upon after great difficulties, solemnly ratified in parliament, but then shelved. When the war between Yugoslavia and Germany neared its end, I extended spiritual aid to the Catholic soldiers of the former Yugoslav army and of the newly created independent State of Croatia. If, therefore, the state had fallen, but the soldiers still remained, I felt obliged to concern myself with this situation. . .

You accuse me as an enemy of the State and the people's authority. I acknowledge your authority. What was my authority? I repeat again: you have been my authority since May 8, 1945, but not before that. Where is it possible in the world to obey two authorities: you in the woods; they in Zagreb?"

†Pattee, pp. 239-240.

CHAPTER IV

Death March and Massacres

The previous chapters have partially explained how Tito maintains his firm terroristic and sadistic grip on Yugoslavia. His dictatorship has been and is frequently challenged, both in an active and passive way, by the Yugoslav peoples, although there is no present possibility of any imminent and effective coup d' etat because of the grim and unfortunate fact that the suppressed millions are devoid of sufficient material means to conduct, en masse, a liberation movement. They are without armaments and, more important, without adequate moral support. In addition to this, they are in a sense psychologically confused—they have suffered so long and have received so little encouragement from the West that apathy and passivity have gripped significant numbers—those who are in exile in the Western Democracies and are able to assist their countrymen in most cases refrain from constructive and concrete benevolent activity in favor of their less fortunate compatriots.

However, the majority of Yugoslav peoples are still optimistic and unafraid, and it is to them that we must pay the highest tribute; for those who fight and struggle for right, regardless of the odds against them, are treasured and valuable gifts to humanity. We can say with a clear conscience, therefore, that regardless of Tito's destructive and tyrannical administrative measures the majority of his saddened peoples are dedicated to the eventual overthrow of his reckless government. It is quite evident that the Marshal realizes this factor for what would his motive be in insisting upon twenty four hour UDBA surveillance of the entire populace? Every phase of daily life is carefully observed—in and around the home, on the streets, at the store, at work, in school, in church, etc. As is true in other communist lands, public gatherings are forbidden without prior permission and authorization from state authorities, and, if and when such sanction is granted, they are guarded by the secret police and if there is any indication of anti-communist criticism or activity, those involved are arrested and confined. One can see, therefore, that, under present circumstances, there is scarcely any opportunity for a coup d' etat in Yugoslavia.

We have stated that Tito prevents significant opposition and hostility to his regime by UDBA assistance. However, this is not his sole means of eliminating revolution or anti-state activity and organization. Where arrest and imprisonment do not bear the desired results, murder and annihilation

of opponents is the a ternative policy. Current events have recorded for history Malenkov's political purges. All would-be dictatorships have followed and must follow this course, and Tito is no exception. From the very beginning of his communist government, this despot, whose name will live in infamy, has resorted to murder of political opponents. The following dialogue will indirectly corroborate this fact.

Q. Mr. Goodman—As you well know, Mr. Stanovnich, there is considerable global criticism of the Yugoslav Communist murderous campaign conducted during May of 1945 when your government actively inaugurated its seizure of political authority. There is particular grave concern about the infamous Bleiburg massacres which were committed under the express command and direct leadership of the present Yugoslav Government. You will undoubtedly recollect that in May of 1945 the Croatian National Army (Croatia was forcefully included in the communist Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia as a member republic in 1945) retreated to the Austrian border, was concurrently assured by the British that it would be sent to Allied prison camps in Austria and Italy, was then willfully disarmed by British military officials, betrayed, and extradited to Marshal Tito. On their march back to central Yugoslavia approximately 150,000 of them were savagely murdered by Tito's merciless militia. This confirmed fact is commonly known and passively accepted by the majority of the world's governments, especially by those Western Democratic powers with a moral conscience. Certainly, Mr. Counselor, you and your government must bow in shame for such uncivilized and bestial conduct, for murdering thousands of your own countrymen. Even though they were not allies and de facto fought against you (the Communist Party of Yugoslavia), they, as prisoners of war, were under the protection of International Law and, more specifically, the Geneva Convention. What is your personal attitude towards this despicable atrocity whose perpetrators were Yugoslav communists, your noble colleagues?

(The Counselor became confused and his face reddened. He nervously pressed forward in his chair and a sarcastic and synical smirk appeared on his dark, mustached face. He angrily glared at me and maintained momentary silence. I then realized that he was not only surprised and amazed at my query but also terrifically angered and somewhat insulted. In view of these external expressions, his reply was most unexpected.)

A. Mr. Stanovnich—Your vigor in relating this fictitious event to me was not only unwarranted but also unnecessary.

We official members of the Yugoslav Government must be, in your ill-advised opinion at least, somewhat stupid and ignorant. You have introduced numerous distortions of real fact in this conference and have, regardless of your own inaccuracy and perverted knowledge of actual internal Yugoslav problems, expected me to confirm these fairy tales. This circumstance is somewhat amusing indeed. The crimes which you allege as facts, Mr. Goodman, are totally unknown to me.

Q. Mr. Goodman—It is strange indeed, Mr. Stanovnich, that you are ignorant of such an outrage that occurred in your own country, when the majority of other governments and peoples know of these atrocities and are well informed about them. I myself have numerous reports on the subject. I am certain that if you will deliberate for a moment, you will remember the Bleiburg massacres. This matter is so important that it has wrought world indignation against Marshal Tito and his henchmen-like Army. Most people frown upon the deliberate and unprovoked mass murder of their fellow man. The present Yugoslav Government is guilty of such a crime. Again, it is rather strange and certainly doubtful that you are unacquainted with the Bleiburg case.

(Mr. Stanovnich was indignant about my persistence in pursuing the point and I can only assume that I intensified his anger. He looked at me grimacingly and then emphatically made the following statement.)

A. Mr. Stanovnich—You have spoken many untruths already, Mr. Goodman, although perhaps unknowingly! However, this one is quite absurd! I cannot recall the alleged Bleiburg crimes! Even if such an event did occur, you certainly cannot believe that our government was the instigator!

Q. Mr. Goodman—I only know what history has recorded, Mr. Stanovnich. I accept as fact only what is reliably and objectively reported and subsequently proven. Survivors of Bleiburg have related their horrible experiences not only to me but to numerous other more important individuals, and scores of documents are publicly available. All of the aforesaid documents, without exception, declare Tito and his political exponents responsible for these massacres. Therefore, I state that the present Yugoslav Government must accept total blame for the said crimes.

A. Mr. Stanovnich—You are amazingly naive, Mr. Goodman, and I am truly shocked at your genuine ignorance of true internal Yugoslav circumstances and conditions. Your informants are, academically speaking, rendering an incalcul-

able disservice to you. Lest you suffer from consequent intellectual disaster, I beg your indulgence in accepting the statements of an authority.

Q. Mr. Goodman—Your opinion notwithstanding, Mr. Counselor, I am quite satisfied with the credibility of my information. My sources are reputable and unquestionably truthful. The individuals with whom I have conferred are honest and sincere, and their reports are borne of actual experience in Yugoslavia, of direct contact with Tito's governing tactics and techniques. I realize, of course, why you attempt to dissuade me from wholehearted and unquestioned acceptance of these documents. Your quite obvious motive is entirely different from that of the exiled immigrants with whom I have conversed. In regard to the Bleiburg massacres I am convinced beyond any doubt whatsoever that your government was the perpetrator and host of these atrocities. Your superiors deliberately liquidated 150,000 members of the Croatian National Army because this group actively disagreed with and openly resisted communistic domination and occupation of their country. To assert otherwise is fruitless, for the available facts reveal the truth. Your confirmation of this truth is another matter and of less concern.

(Mr. Stanovnich became frightfully hostile. He pounded his fist on the arm of his chair and, with evident indignation and animosity, shouted the following statement.)

A. Mr. Stanovnich—*What would you have done to such an imperialistic and inimical group who forcefully challenged the leadership of a man of your choice, my dear Mr. Goodman? Would you have permitted it to run wild and continue its imperialism? You must realize that any group which selfishly and brutally opposes the state must be severely punished! This group, like its ruthless leader, Cardinal Stepinac, was an enemy of the state and the people. It was guilty of untold crimes and massacres against the Yugoslav peoples, and evidence proves that it was an instrument of the Nazi Party and a Hitler puppet. Such a threat to our national security had to be repelled with efficient and effective measures!*

(It is doubtful that the Yugoslav representative then realized the total and real significance of his statement for if he had he would have never made such an announcement. I immediately grasped the implications made by the Counselor and fathomed the indirect confirmation of the Bleiburg massacres that he had irrationally uttered.

The reader can now readily discern the regime of terror in contemporary Yugoslavia. Preceding chapters have elucidated Marshal Tito's sadistic plot against the Yugoslav peoples, his persistent and unscrupulous campaign against human dignity and freedom of conscience. The above dialogue, however, verifies one of the supreme examples of Belgrade's demagoguery and chicanery. The cynicism and shoddiness of the Tito regime can now be a more evident reality to the reader.)

Q. Mr. Goodman—I am profoundly thankful for the statement that you just made for it gives positive and ample documentation and eloquent testimony to my contention that your government is seriously remiss in its code of ethics and morality, that the communist regime which you represent is headed by a ruthless man who would implement any measure, regardless of its nature, to eliminate those who oppose him. Your indirect confirmation of the Bleiburg massacres is most appreciably received.

A. Mr. Stanovnich—Although you may slant my statement to serve your purpose and document your radical and scandalous assertion, I have merely stated in fact that state criminals must be punished. I have confirmed absolutely nothing, but you are free to conclude what you may.

Q. Mr. Goodman—I have no reason to believe that your statement could have been other than an indirect confirmation, Mr. Counselor, for a correct application of fundamental logic and reasoning would not permit a different conclusion. However devoted you may be to your diplomatic purpose, words such as you have uttered clearly convey the truth. Whether it grieves you to admit this certitude is of no concern to me. Your statement is nevertheless considered to be of utmost significance and importance.

Author's Commentary

Never before had I been so deeply moved about the inferno created by the Yugoslav Communist Dictatorship than during the above discussion with Mr. Stanovnich. Prior to this conference I had only studied the situation and conferred with well informed Yugoslav exiles, thereby not fully realizing the Godless ruthlessness of the Communist Hierarchy centered in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. Mr. Stanovnich's indirect verification of this ruthlessness, with no apparent shame or sorrow or repulsion of such mass annihilation, shocked me very much and intensified my self—admitted hatred of Marxian Com-

munism. I marvelled at his ignobility, his disbelief in the moral and ethical code, his selfish and exaggerated individualism, and his complete disregard for human life. I then remembered, however, that Mr. Stanovnich represents a typical communist, that his attitudes and socio-political convictions are not in any way opposed to or different from those of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Malenkov, Tito, and likewise on down the line of their political exponents. I was talking to a man who represented the Yugoslav Government ideologically as well as diplomatically. His reflections were those of the hireling, his statements, mothered by intense communistic indoctrination, those of the dedicated Marxists in Belgrade. How could any ethically-conscious state deal with such a government? That is a question of grave and important international concern.

There are voluminous factual analyses of Yugoslav communist criminal conduct; many of them have been circulated among the American public. Perhaps one of the most revealing accounts of these atrocities is the one that follows. It was submitted to me by an exile a few months ago, a man whose integrity and credibility is unmatched.

DOCUMENT A

During the last world war I lived in the place of my birth, a large village located in the midst of surrounding mountains. Because of the vast forests which enveloped it, the place was constantly endangered by communist partisans, who took me to prison in 1943 for a short time. It was through the efforts of two young partisans that I again regained my freedom.

I lived in V., my place of birth, until mid-1942. V. is located in the P. Mountains; there is another very large village about thirty miles (fifty kilometers) further. The communist partisans took V. at the end of 1942, and it was at this time that they killed my school-mate, J. M., the village teacher. Another community teacher, C. S., was also killed. These communist victims were deprived of all their clothing and taken, in mid-winter, a couple of miles outside the village. In addition to this, both were bound in chains. When the partisans could not remove the chains from M., they expedited matters by cutting his hands off.

Simultaneous to this event, other brutalities occurred. There were two battalions of Croatian National Army soldiers in the same village. When the hostilities of the war had momentarily ceased, these soldiers retreated into an old castle, which was located in the center of the village. Here, encircled by communist partisans, they maintained constant vigil against the invaders. At the close of eight days their water and food supply was gone, their only alternative was to attack the partisans. They did this early in January of 1943.

After the assault had progressed for several days, some Croatian soldiers reached the house of M. U., whose home was used by the communist partisans as storage space for food supplies. The old lady had

compassion for her countrymen and gave them some food. When the partisans were informed of her charity, they instantly killed her. When her widowed husband protested, they tortured him so brutally that my father, who met Mr. U. a few weeks later, could not readily recognize him. The partisans occupied this sector until the spring of 1943. Many people suffered during their merciless occupation.

As is already known, communist leaders despise religion, and especially the ministers of Christ. Reverend J. M., a parish priest in V., fell victim to partisan brutalities. The communists tried their best to find him guilty of violating some civil law but, because of his innocence and obedience, they could not bring valid charges against him. Their only alternative was to accuse him of crimes that he did not actually commit. This they did. In their quest for charges against this priest, Z. U., a sixteen year old boy, became a communist instrument. They tortured the boy in an effort to get him to accuse the above-mentioned priest of a crime. The boy courageously refused to relent to the partisan requests, and so they removed his nails and tortured him with burning embers. Soon the boy became insane and, a few weeks later, disappeared. The partisans then took Father M. into the woods not far from S. D. and shot him.

Reverend J. B. from P. S., the pastor of a neighboring church, was informed that the parish church in V. was to be looted by communist partisans. In order to save Church property from communist expropriation, Father B. removed all Church books and also the Statue of Our Lady from the V. parish. Later the partisans captured P. S. and imprisoned Father B. for the above-mentioned deed. Then Father B. was subjected to a mock trial and sentenced to death. On December 8, 1943, they took him into a woods near P. where he was nailed on a tree. He remained there until death.

The communist partisans were guilty of many additional crimes. C. L. the mayor of my village, was dismembered by an axe at the hands of women partisans. J. N., the leader of the Croatian National Youth, was slashed with knives and salt poured on his open wounds. In our district, P. S., there was a small hospital. When the partisans took this hospital, all interned patients were immediately killed.

When I was captured in 1943 in the P. Mountains, the captors asked our group for identification of Ustache soldiers. When a man pointed one out, the prison commissar immediately shot the man before our eyes.

In all of the above-mentioned cases only the case of Reverend B. was referred to a court. Cases of such massacres and crimes are many. Numerous surviving witnesses are still living in Yugoslavia today. Some of them, however, are living in countries outside of Yugoslavia. Many of them are personal friends of mine.

It is now a corroborated fact that the greatest massacres were committed against Croatian soldiers and civilians in May of 1945 at the Austrian-Slovenian border. On May 6, 1945, I heard from my friends as well as over the radio that the command for the retreat of German and Croatian armies had been given. The general opinion was that we were to be liberated to the Allies at the Austrian border in order to receive Allied assistance against the communists. The populace believed that the Croatian war-time government had made liberation agreements with American and British authorities, and therefore many civilians joined our caravan to the border.

On our journey, the first communist partisan troops that I met were a few miles outside of Celje, Slovenia. At the entrance to Celje, German soldiers willingly surrendered their armaments to the communist partisans. Croatian soldiers and officers, however, resisted giving the partisans their arms because they seemed to perceive the dangers that would result from disarmament. After some struggle, we prolonged the way and came to Windischgratz. We remained in this small city awhile, and then proceeded to Drauburg. We approached a bridge near Drauburg where a Croatian officer who was passing our group shouted: "My friends, we have been deceived! Whoever wants freedom can flee with us into the woods!" I believed this Croatian officer more than I did the communist partisans, so I turned back and looked for some Croatian-led group. Finally I found a group led by Colonel S., a man whom I knew and trusted. Major K., a junior officer in Colonel S.'s command, asked me to find the extent of communist partisan concentration towards Bleiburg. I was appointed Colonel S.'s scout and went towards Bleiburg to carry out my assignment.

On the way I became tired and hungry. Soon I approached a small hut and the kind owner gave me room and board for two days. On one of these days the owner's wife went to Schwarzenbach to purchase some flour for baking purposes. When she returned she told me that the communists were putting Croatian soldiers on trucks and sending them back to Croatia. Other than this, I also heard that the British had disarmed the soldiers and then refused them entrance to Austria. After long deliberation I decided to surrender and go directly to the communist leaders. It was my greatest mistake.

Towards Schwarzenbach I met a young man wearing a communist partisan uniform. We began to converse with each other, and later on I learned that he was from a solid Catholic family and had entered the communist army only because of the German menace. While we were walking along, another young man with a German machine gun approached and joined our small group. The three of us proceeded to Communist Headquarters in Schwarzenbach. When I arrived, these same two men searched my pockets and placed me in a cell. Later they brought three other Croatians into my quarters. I think that we were there about one week. On the last day, after lengthy interrogation, the same communist partisans whom I had met a week or so before came into our cell and beat us. Through my prison door I could hear other partisans suggesting a woman to continue beating us. Her name was Savka. Savka replied: "I can't beat them! I am too exhausted!"

After a few hours had passed, our captors took us out into a courtyard and put us in a group composed of Croatian soldiers and officers. These poor prisoners had also been beaten and were almost ready to collapse. The same beastly woman (Savka) mentioned above had beaten them so long that she became extremely fatigued, and that is why she refused to beat our group a few hours before. After we had remained in the courtyard awhile, they transferred us to another part of the village and placed us in a larger building, which was operated under the command of a larger communist military unit. Then, after a few days, they loaded us on trucks and took us to another town. Then we had to walk to Drauburg, and from there to Windischgratz. In front of the Communist Headquarters in W. the commanding officer approached our group and said to the soldiers who brought us: "Why did you bring them here? You should have followed orders and liquidated them along the way! Don't bring any more of them here! As for this group, we shall

retain them for the night." I do not remember the name of the commissar, but I do know that he had been a former Serbian school teacher.

When the stated confusion had subsided, they put us in a large room which was, in my opinion, a former school room. There were about 70 of us. Periodically a group of communist officers would come to interrogate us. At all times we were carefully guarded by two communist partisan soldiers. I expected all of us to be imminently killed, but the partisans had an orgy in the courtyard that night and so we were saved for the moment.

Later some officials (Croatian) in our group had to undergo special interrogation. One of those who was interrogated later told me that the partisans took him to their private quarters and beat him. They trampled on him and broke several of his ribs. After they were through questioning him, they pushed him down the stairs (leading to the first floor), his hands bound in chains. In a few days the partisans told us that we were going to be sent to work in Vojvodina. Some of our group was sent there, but we later learned that the majority of them were liquidated.

Days passed, and soon our large group was divided into several smaller groups, and each section was put in a separate room. There were about 20 people in my cell. Every night we would hear, through the walls and doors of our cell, screams from those who were being tortured in neighboring cells. At about mid-night on one evening we heard the partisans taking prisoners from the nearby rooms into the courtyard. The prisoners were left there all night. A few days later I met a man who was in our building and he told me that he saw the group when it was being led into the courtyard, and that partisans were beating and whipping the prisoners all the way.

The next day we were ordered to clean the yard and scrub the interior of the building. Later we were taken to a work camp and subjected to forced labor. One day a communist soldier came up to our group, waved his pistol proudly, and said: "I killed 1200 Ustache with this." A few days later we were taken to a railroad yard, put on freight trains, and told that we were being sent to Maribor. I thought that we were going home because we had only two guards with us. When we arrived at Maribor, however, we were again put into a carefully guarded building (prison). Here, also, we were forced to work in railroad yards.

After a brief sojourn in Maribor, we were loaded on trucks (our group included Romanians, Hungarians, Germans and Croatians) and taken to the Yugoslav-Austrian border in order to work in an underground German factory in Aflenz. The factory was heavily guarded and the children in the village were not even permitted to give us packages of food. One day a new prisoner from North Croatia arrived. Because he had a different dialect than the rest of the Croatian prisoners, the communists suspected him and later shot him.

I could continue my story ad infinitum. The above incidents, however, are indelibly impressed upon my mind. I saw and experienced these horrible atrocities while a communist partisan prisoner during the most bloody days of the communist rise to power. My experiences were not even as bad as those of thousands and thousands of my poor countrymen. All of my statements are, in God's name, true, and I am ready to swear that all I have told is in accordance with my best recollection of the events as they actually happened.

Submitted by,
Mr. M. M.

The preceding credendum, which explicitly relates the horror and bloodshed imposed upon the Yugoslav peoples by their savage dictator, testifies to the conduct and attitude of the Yugoslav Government towards civil liberties, human dignity, the sacred value of human life, etc. The following document is included to prove to the reader that these accounts are not singular; that, if space permitted, scores of the same pieces justificatives could be included.

DOCUMENT B

Upon the kind and thoughtful invitation of a personal friend, who had nothing but good intention in his gesture, I went from Z. to K. (Northwestern Croatia) towards the last of May, 1945. On my journey to K., I saw communist partisans angrily pursuing several large groups of Croatian soldiers in a gigantic effort to prevent the latter group from reaching the Austrian border in a courageous flight for freedom. There were several hundred men in each group of soldiers. The partisans rode on horseback and were heavily armed with machine guns, revolvers, and long, sharp whips. When the prisoners became exhausted from extensive marching and began to collapse or lag along the way, they were immediately shot by their communist captors. In view of this, only the young and strong remained. While marching through the towns and villages, the people tried to help the soldiers by secretly distributing small packets of food among them. When the communists noticed this 'traitorous' activity, they instantly shot the perpetrators.

The pre-planned destination for this march of thousands and thousands of Croatian soldiers was Valdovo (in Macedonia) and Vrsac (in Banat), special concentration camps. A large percentage of the civilian population, especially from Bosnia and South Croatian sections, escaped and went towards the Austrian border with the Croatian Army. Young civilian males were placed in separate sections and were sent with hasty dispatch back to Yugoslavia. A lady who was in such a group related the following to me:

Communist authorized passes were given to the oldest man in the group. Regardless of this, however, armed partisans guarded these groups to make sure that they returned to Yugoslavia. When I was in such a group and was returning to Zagreb, I saw 30 to 50 people lying along the roadside in puddles of blood—evidently recently murdered. At one house we asked for water. A female communist guard took the rope from the well, which was located outdoors, and told us that she would return soon. After an extended wait she returned on a motorcycle in the company of three other partisans. They asked us where we were from and we told them from Zagreb, Croatia. They took us into a field. The old man who carried our pass could not march as fast as we, and so lagged behind. The partisans then commanded us to form a circle and then pointed machine guns at us. In the meanwhile, another partisan approached the old man, who was now far away from us, and handed him an envelope. The old man opened it and read the enclosed message, and then shouted to our captors: "Don't shoot! Here is an order!" And so we were saved. Many other similar civilian groups were not saved, but rather brutally massacred.

(Mr. S. continues his personal story.)

When I was in jail in Zagreb with other civilian prisoners, I personally saw many of our groups taken away every night. They were killed and thrown into ditches. I knew a couple of people who were in such groups. They regained their freedom, however, because stray communist-fired bullets severed the wire with which they were bound. They escaped in the night unnoticed. A former partisan judge told me that he pronounced 600 death sentences daily in the early part of 1945 when the communist partisans were seizing power.

There are scores of other witnesses of horrible communist massacres of the National Ustache Croatian Youth Organization. These youths were between 13 and 16 years of age. In order to camouflage these bloody sights and imploring screams of inhuman torture, the communists played records over a public address system and turned the volume as high as possible. In this way they covered up the screams of dying victims.

That was the beginning of the hell which still exists today in many forms in Tito's Yugoslavia.[7]

Submitted by,
Mr. J. S.

* * *

How human beings can behave so savagely is beyond comprehension. The above accounts, however, clearly enunciate the reality of the reign of terror in contemporary Yugoslavia. This truth, however well known, in no way influences some western statesmen who are, regardless of the pain it inflicts upon Yugoslav humanity, presently cooperating with Marshal Tito and helping him maintain his totalitarianism. Some powers have even gone so far as to play host to Tito and lavishly entertain him in western style.[8] The prudence, moral soundness, and wisdom of such a policy is certainly questionable. Whether it is a policy moulded for expediency or not, such abominable indirect condonement of bestiality cannot be explained in polite and favorable terms.

[7]The names of those who submitted Documents A and B are withheld for security reasons. Specific names and places within the text of the documents themselves are abbreviated for the same purpose—to protect friends and relatives who are still living in Yugoslavia.

[8]C. F. London recently invited Tito to the British capital and extended royal courtesies and entertainment to him. President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, however, flatly refused to join company with this same communist dictator and deliberately and purposefully dissuaded him from coming to Washington.

CHAPTER V

The Peoples of Yugoslavia and Self-Determination

Yugoslavia is composed of the most varied and clashing ethnic and cultural elements. These diverse and dissident segments of culture, religion, and social organization date from the earliest times, their definite origins having not yet been positively established, although competent and industrious historians have theorized and conducted a commendable amount of scientific research on the subject.

Today, more than ever before, the cleavage and antagonism between nationalities and cultures is gradually and progressively approaching its climax—direct hostile conflict between ethnic groups. I questioned Mr. Stanovnich on this paramount problem and his only comment is the one that follows:

Q. Mr. Goodman—In reading historical accounts of ethnical circumstances in Yugoslavia, and in frequent conversations with immigrants from Yugoslavia, I have learned that there is, as in the past, considerable social and ethnical diversity and complexity in your country, that most of the five basic nationalities have separate nationalistic tendencies and spirits of their own, thereby reducing the possibility of social unity, as well as justice, under one Yugoslav State. How is this problem being approached by the Yugoslav Government?

A. Mr. Stanovnich— *In retrospect, it is quite true that ethnical troubles existed in my country. However, since the creation of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, many of these same problems have been solved and almost completely erased. All I have to say is that there are few present social and ethnical difficulties.*

Author's Commentary

Regardless of the conviction of Mr. Stanovnich about the social and political harmony in his multi-national country, historical evidence and a true appraisal of the current situation will prove the contrary. A brief historical background of the various nationalities in Yugoslavia is here introduced to document the author's contention that additional political disunity has resulted from Tito's unwise proclamation of a Federal People's Republic.

Constituent ethnic groups in Yugoslavia are: Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians, and Montenegrins. Let us consider for a moment the elementary characteristics of each of these groups.

The dark type predominates in Serbia as a result of Serbian inter-marriage with the indigenous populations of Dacian,

Thracian, and others of Greek origin—Serbian skin is consequently of dark pigmentation. These people have traditionally and historically followed the Eastern civilization of Europe and, broadly speaking, since the Eastern civilization is generally totalitarian (Byzantine Empire, Russian Tsars, Russian Communism), Serbia has a definite militaristic heritage. Until the nineteenth century, Serbia was under Turkish domination, a complement of the Byzantine tradition. After the Serbs were liberated from the Turks, the former "corruption, violence and murder continued to be practiced."[9] Contemporary Serbs, as John Gunther so capably and adeptly states, are "a Balkan folk centering in Belgrade, Greek Orthodox in religion, semi-Turkish in culture, and militant in spirit."[10] In 1905, a civil revolution against the Turks occurred in Serbia under Karageorge, the founder of the Karadjordjevic dynasty. Although the original motivation was resistance to local Turkish tyranny, the coup d' etat broadened into a struggle for autonomy; and, in 1812, with the help of Russia, Karageorge won limited autonomy; only to be again denied by Turkish invasion and occupation in 1813. In 1815, Miles Obrenovic, with Russian assistance, regained Serbian autonomy, and when Karadjordjevic returned to Serbia, Milos had his rival secretly murdered. After frequent reshuffling of leaders, Alexander Kardjordjevic was elected hereditary ruler of Serbia in 1843. In 1856, in the Treaty of Paris, Serbian autonomy was guaranteed by all Europe and she thus became an European, instead of Russian, interest and responsibility. From 1918, in the Serb-Croat-Slovene Kingdom (later Yugoslavia), Serbia has assumed a dominant chauvinistic role.

The Croats are of a comparatively fair complexion due to their marital mixture with the Illyrians, Italic Romans, Celts, and others. Religiously, these people are predominantly Roman Catholic and have an assimilated Western culture with particular emphasis upon their own political and cultural independence. After having had their own independent state under Croatian royalty for nearly two hundred years (from the beginning of the tenth to the beginning of the twelfth century), they entered into closer alliance with the Hungarians. Although Turkey conquered the greater part of Croatian territory during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, North Croatia nevertheless remained in personal union with the Austrian Empire (Austrian Emperor was Croatian King, but the Croats retained their autonomy, having their own parliament—Sabor—in Zagreb, and their own executive authority in

[9]Ostovic, THE TRUTH ABOUT YUGOSLAVIA, p. 107.

[10]Ibidem, quoted by the above author.

the person of Ban—the Vice King) and thus preserved her Christian character and Western culture. The Northern Croats of Banovina were associated with Hungary for eight centuries and with the Viennese for the last four centuries. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, because of Austro-Hungarian centralism, the Croats developed strong desires for their own independence. Some of them were idealistically inclined to a common state with other South Slav peoples, not bearing in mind the imperialistic tendencies of their future associates, the Serbs. In 1918, a Serb-Croat-Slovene Kingdom was formulated under the political leadership of the Royal House of Karadjordjevic. In 1928, King Alexander changed the name to Yugoslavia. At the time of Turkish domination the majority of Croats in Bosnia accepted Islamism but, although under Turkish cultural influence, retained their Croatian national consciousness and are still spirited Croats today. "The Croats, centering in Zagreb, lived for centuries in the orbit of Vienna and represent a more Western culture and tradition," reflects John Gunther.[11]

The Slovenes, until the year 772, were under Frankish influence. From 772 to 1918, a period of 1146 years, they were under German and Austrian culture and influence. Their speech, type, and temperament is that of the Slav ethnic group. They are a well advanced people and are culturally complementary to any other European people. In a word, they are "frugal, industrious, law-abiding."[12]

Macedonians, because of their Turkish and Byzantine heritage, are in many ways similar to the Serbs, but they are more frugal and industrious than the latter and have an improved sense of realism.

The Montenegrins are Serbs, and they so consider themselves. However, there is a notable distinction between them and the Serbs of Serbia, for their historical and cultural heritages are completely different. The Montenegrins were never completely dominated by the Turks because of their geopolitical circumstances. These people are chivalric and possess a knightly code of honor. They allied themselves with Peter the Great of Russia in 1710 in the latter's war against Turkey. In succeeding years, particularly in the Balkan War of 1812, the Montenegrins heroically fought for their freedom and for the preservation of liberty. They were never reconciled, however, to their being a mere province of Serbia and, in the Second World War, many of them fought for national liberation (not fully cognizing the bitter and tragic results) under

[11]Ibidem, p. 108.

[12]Ibidem, p. 116.

Tito. After the war, Montenegro became one of the six federal republics of Yugoslavia. (See ethnographical map of Yugoslavia on p. 56)

The new Constitution of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia given at Belgrade, January 31, 1946, arbitrarily divided the new state into six republics and two autonomous regions: the newly established republics include Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Montenegro, Bosnia-Hercegovina, and Macedonia. The autonomous regions are Vojvodina and Kosovo-Metohijan, both territories annexed to the Serbian Republic, although there are not Serbian ethnical majorities in these areas. (See political map of Yugoslavia on p. 57)

It must be carefully noted, and this is of great importance, that the above-mentioned republics are composed of and inhabited by Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Montenegrins, and Croats (c. 3/5) and Serbs (c. 2/5) in Bosnia and Hercegovina, and Macedonians, respectively.[13] Just as Germany predominantly includes those of German nationality, Italy, Italian nationality, etc., Croatia likewise includes those of Croatian nationality, Serbia, Serbian nationality, and so on down the list of ethnic groups. Why these nationalities are so intermingled into one organized state poses a multitude of complex questions. Tito, however, has some very obvious reasons for this, the most important one being that with a combined state, communistic totalitarian authority can be more extensive and far-reaching. That, of course, is the ultimate objective of any dictator.

In the majority of cases, boundaries of Yugoslav federal republics are historically correct, with the exception of Croatia. Regarding this, Mr. P. D. Ostovic, who, compared to others, can be considered an objective analyst of Yugoslav social-ethnical conditions, states:[14]

> . . . Croatia surrendered (per force) part of the province of Syrmia to Vojvodina (Serbian Republic) and the Bay of Kotor to Montenegro; and Serbia, which includes two autonomous territories acquired in 1912, and in 1918 respectively . . . Thus we have in Yugoslavia two Croatian (Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina) and two Serbian Republics (Serbia and Montenegro).

[13]The very division of Yugoslavia into six republics suggests that each republic has its own nationality. The republics really refer to distinct nationalities, with the exception of Bosnia-Hercegovina, where two separate nationalities, the Croats (c. 3/5) and the Serbs (c. 2/5), are included together. At the time of the Turkish invasions, the Serbs migrated to Bosnia as refugees from their homeland, Serbia.

[14]Ostovic, P. D., **THE TRUTH ABOUT YUGOSLAVIA**, p. 252. We recognize Mr. Ostovic's objectivity in the book while giving a historical and ethnical survey of Yugoslav nationalities and a description of the dictatorial rule of the Serbian clique in the first Yugoslavia. We sharply disagree, however, with his approach towards the present communist Yugoslavia, and especially with his firm opinion about the actual impossibility of solving the Yugoslav question on the basis of self-determination of peoples outside of a Federal Yugoslavia.

ETHNICAL MAP OF YUGOSLAVIA

(66)

POPULATION IN 1948 = 6,731,555
AREA = 99,044 SQ. MILES

Photo from P. Ostovic's Book

(67)

As stated previously, Yugoslavia is today a Peoples' Republic and not a national state. Frequent reference to a Yugoslav state, pronounced by old Yugoslavia and now by Communist Yugoslavia, is only the means of concealing and denying the real existence of the above-mentioned nationalities of which Yugoslavia is comprised. The Serbs are using the term 'Yugoslav nationality' with the deliberate intention of denying the Croatian name, national characteristics, and rights. The Serbian desire to assimilate all nationalities, especially the Croats, into a single Yugoslav nationality was and is only a preconceived means of transitionally modifying all ethnic groups into one Serbian nationality.

We have frequently referred to the word 'nationality' in this chapter, and therefore a sociological explanation of this term is necessary. By nationality, we mean an ethnic group with its own way of life, history, culture, and tradition. If such groups have already had, have now, or are capable of having their own national state where only one people (nationality) is predominant, they are also called nations.

We have already said that there are not one but five major nationalities in Communist Yugoslavia, and they are as follows: Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, Macedonians, and Montenegrins. In regard to the approximate percentage of Croats, Slovenes, etc. in the ethnical composition of the state, subsequent statistics will serve us well. The Croats, Serbs, and Slovenes, the three largest ethnical groups, are statistically distributed as follows: Croats (5,500,000), Serbs (6,500,000), and Slovenes (1,100,000).[15] The Montenegrins and Macedonians, numerically less prominent, include 342,000 and 810,000 respectively.[16] From the point of view of religious affiliation, the Croats and Slovenes are predominantly Roman Catholic; the Serbs, Macedonians, and Montenegrins, Greek Orthodox; of the Bosnian Croats, the majority are Moslems. The following table indicates the religious distribution of the Yugoslav population:[17]

	Per Cent
Greek Orthodox	48.70
Roman Catholic	37.45
Greek Catholic	0.05
Old Catholic	0.05
Protestant (Lutheran)	1.26
Protestant (Calvinist)	0.40
Other Christians	0.12
Moslem	11.20
Jewish	0.49

[15]Pattee, Richard, THE CASE OF CARDINAL ALOYSIUS STEPINAC, (The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1953), p. 19.

[16]Ostovic, p. 119.

[17]Pattee, p. 23.

Geographically, Croatia is centrally located between Slovenia, Serbia, and Montenegro. By virtue of her (Croatia's) geographical position, it may be authentically contended that the very existence of Yugoslavia depends almost entirely upon the political will of the Croatian people.

We will recall that a Serb-Croat-Slovene Kingdom was organized in 1918 and, because of the unjust and hostile conduct of the Serbs towards the Croats, the latter were dissatisfied with the Kingdom from the very beginning and a strong desire for Croatian independence and statehood developed. One of the charges against Cardinal Stepinac, Archbishop of Zagreb and Metropolitan of Croatia, accused him of recognizing a spontaneous proclamation by plebiscite of Croatian independence in April, 1941, before the German occupation of Croatia had been accomplished and the pro-German Ustacha government established. In his famous defense speech during the trial of 1946, the Cardinal stated:

> The Croatian nation unanimously declared itself for the Croatian State and I would have been remiss had I not recognized and acknowledged this desire of the Croatian people enslaved by the former Yugoslavia . . .[18]

The Croats, therefore, who are de facto culturally superior to the Serbs, unanimously decided and subsequently manifested their will for independence, their demand for recognition of their God-given right to have and to be in their own independent and democratic state. Many of the unfortunate events from 1941 to 1945 can be explained only in the light of the above-mentioned facts. Strong movements for independence can also be found in Macedonia and Slovenia, and these strong motivations and desires can be quelled under no circumstances. The people are determined to realize their objectives and nothing else will terminate their courageous struggle.

The above paragraphs clearly indicate how Tito and the Communist Party of Yugoslavia forcefully negated the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the peoples of Yugoslavia by forming an artificial state of six federal republics. Also, we must note that the Serbs have remained the most dominant and powerful political force in contemporary Yugoslavia. It is commonly known in well informed circles that the majority of members of the Yugoslav Communist Party are Serbs and that they, consequently, occupy state positions of political

[18]Ibidem, p. 40.

importance. Mr. Stanovnich refused to discuss and deliberately avoided my interrogations concerning the national ethnical and political question in Yugoslavia because he too realized that this is the most delicate and critical problem presently confronting the Yugoslav Government.

Let us now briefly consider a desired solution to this very real ethnical controversy, and we shall do so keeping the principles of international moral law always foremost in our thoughts. What can be done to eliminate ethnical antagonism and ease political tension in contemporary Yugoslavia? How can solidarity and, above all, justice towards all Yugoslav nationalities be rightfully attained? Although Tito consistently refuses to meet the situation in accordance with ethical principles and invariably maintains that his People's Republic is the final solution to all ethnical and cultural diversities, we have proven that this allegation is in no way accurate. We reiterate again that ethnical clashes in Yugoslavia have reached the point of saturation, that something must be done in order to avoid civil revolution.

Not only does the moral and ethical code guarantee to every people (nation) the right to self-determination, so also does the Charter of the United Nations, the Atlantic Charter, and other state documents. Every nation has the right to self-determination, the privilege of organizing and conducting the type of government of its own choosing. It is certain that Yugoslav nationalities comprise such groups for they are all culturally qualified to unite into individual, independent, sovereign states. If the principles of the United Nations' Charter are to be faithfully executed, these peoples must be granted the right to self-determination under the supervision and protection of the United Nations' Organization. We must firmly assert, and manifest our democratic convictions through concrete and constructive action, that no one people is obliged to join a federation unless they so desire—the peoples of Yugoslavia did not sanction collaboration with or inclusion in the present Yugoslav Federal State. We can even more readily comprehend the justification of Croatian and Macedonian resistance to membership in the Yugoslav Federal State because of their previous mistreatment in the first Yugoslavia. These peoples, therefore, have valid and serious reasons for desiring home rule.

Similar rights are applied in private life. Who would condemn a financially powerful man for withdrawing from a corporation if he sees that his wealth and material prosperity can be utilized more desirably and advantageously in a private

business of his own? Likewise, no one people can be forced to sacrifice their natural right to independence if they see that exclusion from federal statehood would be more advantageous to them than would other less prudent courses of action, especially when other courses of action might mean the oppression of their human rights. After independence has been achieved, friendly diplomatic relations with their bordering neighbors can be exercised, and all can live peacefully without rancor and bitterness. That is the only solution to the present ethnical crisis in Yugoslavia, and the UN is morally obliged to grant self-determination to all ethnic groups in Yugoslavia—this principle should also be applied to other communist dominated lands.

In closing, let us remember that Tito and his Yugoslav Communist Hierarchy are deceitfully preaching about brotherhood and unity in order to maintain their already firm grip on all the peoples of Yugoslavia in order to continue their atrocious enslavement of mankind. Their public remarks are deliberately misleading and evasive, and certainly do not represent their internal motives, desires, and convictions. Their only real objective is to keep all Yugoslav peoples under their brutal, savage, and inhumane control. We can safely conclude that the present communist government in Belgrade will never grant its many ethnic groups the right to determne their own political and social status for its only absolute desire is supreme power over all. In view of this, the United Nations, conceived in the minds of men to be the protector and defender of human rights and the fortress of freedom-loving men the world over, must intervene in behalf of the Yugoslav nationalities. If such a policy is not established and pursued with energetic intent and high, purposeful resolve, the UN can be justly considered a total failure because of its own misconduct and insubordination to the provisions of its noble Charter, and, like the League of Nations, go the way of all flesh. Lest such a fate befall us, all peoples everywhere must earnestly and sincerely urge their leaders to fight for justice to all men, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. If all of us serve and dedicate ourselves to this high Christian cause, our recompense will be great and our worldly problems mitigated.

CHAPTER VI

United States-Yugoslav Relations

In the Foreword the author made many assertions which, at the time at least, might have appeared premature and insupportable to the reader. However, previous chapters have solidly and concretely documented the veracity of those statements which appeared in the introductory pages of this dossier. If the reader will seriously ponder the information already presented, objectively analyze its implications, and carefully study the material included in the author's authenticated commentaries, these sobering deductions can be made: the present Yugoslav Government is an absolute communistic dictatorship where the natural rights of free men are rejected and suppressed, where governmental altruism is replaced with oligarchic selfishness, where the rights of one group (the Communist Party) are exaggerated and infringe upon the rights of other groups (peoples of Yugoslavia), where the supplications of saddened, debilitated and oppressed peoples are mercilessly discarded and answered with government edicts of a savage and brutal character, where the lives of languished thousands have been scourged and exterminated to insure the political security of the ruling class. The conditions in Yugoslavia can be epitomized in these words—hell on earth.

Mere discernment of the pain-inflicting results of contemporary Yugoslavia's ugly tyranny is not sufficient. We must, of course, first realize the gravity of the Yugoslav situation in order to mold a definitive and positive policy towards that state. It is this subject that we wish to discuss in the present chapter, and we shall therefore present a brief commentary on United States-Yugoslav relations since the beginning of the Second World War. The soundness of this commentary will be realized only in the light of the previously described internal chaos, ethnical variations, and national tendencies of the peoples of Yugoslavia.

In the United Nations' Declaration of January 2, 1942, the United States allied with China, Great Britain and the Soviet Union in a common struggle against the virulent imperialism of the Axis Powers of Germany, Italy and Japan. America's intervention was juridically and morally justified and her function in resisting and finally repelling Nazi and Facist aggression was not only a necessary and imperative antecedent to the ultimate Allied victory, but also a solemn indication of her resolute dedication to the preservation of justice for all men and of her genuine virtue. In our endeavor, it should have been clear that, once the foe was vanquished,

more perplexing problems would encounter us. Our approach to the liberation of European countries from leftist enslavement should consequently have been more prudently designed. Western statesmen should have intelligently considered the internal conditions of those countries which were victimized. We do not dispute the fact that different circumstances prevailed in Poland, France, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Russia, etc., but we do seriously reprimand and reproach Western statesmen for their imprudent and unrealistic approach to the exigencies of World War II, for their complete disregard of the frequent exhortations of those who understood the more profound qualities of these states and who voiced alternative policies and approaches to the problem which, as we can now see, were conceived in wisdom and foresight. The tragic blunders of Allied statesmen, particularly those of Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill and the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, during the most crucial hours in our history resulted from a lack of understanding of political and national variations in the countries thrown into the conflagration of World War II, from an incredible ignorance of history, past and foreseeable.

Right reason should always be a guidance in human undertakings, especially in a cause so high as a struggle for liberation from imperialistic exploitation and Godless bondage. It is an indisputable fact that we were too eager to find Allies in World War II, without due concern for their honesty, sincerity, and morality. *How fruitless it is to join arms with one despot in order to defeat another, when such cooperation only results in a replacement of the latter with the former? This paradox occurred in World War II, and that is the precise tragedy about which we are now concerned. Nazistic tyranny in East Germany, Austria, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia was replaced by a communistic tyranny which, through the later conquering of China, became an imminent menace to the whole world.* To have chosen cooperation with Soviet Russia in the last world war is indicative of superficial judgment, and this unfortunate association was the father of the present chaotic state of the world. A special Machiavellian role was assumed by Great Britain under the leadership of Winston Churchill.

Here we surface a fact which bears thought-provoking implications. In normal daily social relations we refrain from intimate association with people who are known to be dishonest. Moral characteristics are considered by every average man to be indications of how much good we can expect from another man. If a man's good moral character can be sus-

tained before others, this is an assurance to us that he is trustworthy and loyal to the confidence placed in him. This is a man whose company and friendship we would safeguard and cherish. If, however, we discover a man's immoral and dishonest qualities, his utilitarian and pragmatic ideals, and his radical individualism, we then shun him and refuse mutual association or collaboration. We form a judgment which is often pronounced in social life: I cannot depend upon him.

In association and collaboration with low-minded and ignominious men, even if we do so with good intentions, the public will conclude that we are no better than they. We will share full responsibility for everything that happens, and the resultant consequences of our alliance will be borne by us as well as by others. The public will at least call us 'suckers' and 'ignoramuses.'

Despite the complexities which confronted us in World War II and the urgency of immediate assistance, Britain and the United States had sufficient proofs about the perverse moral stature of the Soviet Union. Their naivete is inexcusable. How could 'Uncle Joe' have abruptly transformed himself into a good and faithful man and have given us reasonable and sincere assurances of his humanitarian interest, when the fact that he was a ruthless murderer, robber, and oppressor had already been established before the world? With foresight and intelligent appraisal, the Allies could also have learned in 1942 that Tito, as nominal and active leader of the Yugoslav Communist Party, was closely allied with Stalin, that he also disregarded the moral code and had only his own communistic aims in mind. How can we condone our former administration for giving moral support and material aid to such a sadistic and depraved communist? Can we not conclude that this cooperation reflects either a sympathetic attitude towards communism, or a crass ignorance about great numbers of peoples who are in strategic positions in the European theatre? Neither pro-communist sympathies nor ignorance is excusable or tolerable.

It is frequently alleged that we were incapable of perceiving the real nature of Tito's purposes during the war, that the facts now known were not manifested or readily recognizable during the early days of battle. Although such assertions are inaccurate, we might pose these questions: Why, when Tito betrayed the Allies by preventing the self-determination of his peoples and by supplanting the natural rights of his subjects, did the British and United States' Governments maintain their cooperative relationship with Marshal Tito? Why, in lieu of

severance of friendly association with Tito, did the West recognize his communistic government and subsequently, directly and indirectly, provide him with moral and material succor?

In the author's opinion, a government can be justly recognized by a second government only if the first one has a genuine democratic basis—only if it is willingly supported by a majority of its population. It is not at all a difficult or cumbersome task to secure the real internal status of respective countries. *It is a certitude that if we recognize a tyrannic government, as are all contemporary communistic governments, we are committing a grave injustice against the peoples who are enslaved by that government.* These tyrants are receiving the direct recognition which de facto belongs to the legal representatives of the people. In such recognition we are granting moral support to an illegitimate government, which means that all communistic governments sanctioned by the West through diplomatic recognition are enjoying the privileges of the latter's moral support in international relations. In this respect, concrete action should be forthcoming by the United Nations in favor of enslaved and suffering peoples. First and foremost, something positive should be done in relation to constituent members of the UN. Ejaculations about offenses against state sovereignty and protestations against interference in the internal affairs of another state are heard today in order to conceal the internal tyranny and illegal status of non-democratic—most often communistic—governments.

Educated men who occupy responsible state positions are expected to profit by experience and past errors instead of multiplying their mistakes. Today we are witnesses of the gross miscalculations of former President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson in regard to their declared post-war policy towards Yugoslavia. Their inability, perhaps by deliberate design or through historic obliviousness, to benefit from the apparent mistakes of their predecessors has inflicted untold agony upon the peoples of Yugoslavia. It has made the many problems which already confront these peoples appear even more insuperable than before. Truman's and Acheson's direct assistance to Tito's iron rule over these millions of Europeans has seriously prejudiced American honor and prestige in Yugoslavia. We hear so much current, idle, almost irresponsible, conversation on the dangerous threat that Senator Joseph McCarthy presents to United States' prestige abroad—these chatterings are voiced by some of this nations hightest-placed men. Is a national campaign

against the ugly forces of communism more threatening to America's good name abroad than direct United States' economic and military assistance to communism? Let us open the pages of histroy and reveal the vicious results of American aid to Marshal Tito.

There is a modified reluctant concession that perhaps a partial excuse can be contrived for the initial support and sustenance given Tito by the representatives of the former administration, who nourished the hope that, with the war's end, Tito's bloody revenges and persecutions would cease. There is, however, absolutely no conceivable or satisfying reason for continued economic and military aid in the light of obstinate and persistent oppression of the peoples of Yugoslavia in their religious, political, and economic rights. Continued subsidization of this nature is actually fortifying a communist government in its tyrannical hold over its subjects. In reply to a communication written by an associate of the author to former President Harry S. Truman and Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson, the State Department alleged a moral responsibility to solidify Tito's government, and tried to justify itself by stating:

> United States' recognition of the present government of Yugoslavia and granting of assistance to Yugoslavia do not reflect approval or endorsement by the United States' Government of the internal policies of the Yugoslav Government. Namely, assistance should not be interpreted as meaning endorsement of the measures undertaken by the government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia suppressing or destroying religious, political or economic liberty in Yugoslavia.

But we have the right and duty to ask: when we are aware of the deplorable and sad realities resulting from aid to such a communistic government, how can we then boldly isolate our intentions from the knowledge of these evils? Evidence of negative effects, enhanced by United States' assistance, is the basis and core of American responsibility. It is of no concern or consequence if the actor (the United States' Government) publicly declares more noble intentions: he is, nevertheless, documentarily and testamentarily acquainted with the grim misfortunes of his policy. If positive as well as negative effects co-existed, the severity of our critical attitude could be somewhat altered. We can tolerate the undesirable repercussions of an act provided there are beneficial effects which are at least proportionate to the evil results, and these results are alone sincerely desired as well as sought for by the agent. He must merely permit the evil which he foresees will follow from his chosen course of action.

Our premise is that, in the case under consideration, positive U. S. advantage does not result from aid to Tito. The only

alleged favorable consequence of this aid is what Mr. Acheson unsagaciously referred to as a "calculated risk," an effect which de facto exists only in the imagination. The United States has no substantial guarantees that Tito, in case of formal attack, will remain aligned with her. But even if such guarantees were in our possession, mere promises from communists, verbal or written, cannot justify economic and military aid to a government, like Tito's, that actually oppresses ninety per cent of its subjects.

I conferred recently with some Americans of Croatian descent who toured Yugoslavia in the summer of 1952 and visited almost all of Yugoslavia, especially Croatian districts, which contain about one third of all Yugoslav territory and population. This question was asked of the native population: "In case of a Russian attack upon Yugoslavia, would you help defend Tito against the invaders?" The general reply to this delicate and important query was: "We and our sons in the Yugoslav Army will first fight against Tito to remove him as soon as possible; then we will fight the Russians!" Such a sincere conviction is reasonable and psychologically understandable. In the wake of the past war between Germany and Yugoslavia, the majority of the army, especially the Croats and Macedonians, refused to defend the Karadjordjevic dictatorship, and this explains the hasty capitulation of Yugoslavia to Germany.

A parallel attitude may be expected today because of the internal policies of Tito's communistic government. The Yugoslav military divisions include Croatian, Macedonian, Slovenian, and Serbian men and boys. Their fathers, mothers, and wives, in towns and villages, are oppressed by the present regime, even in their most fundamental rights. As we have already proven in other chapters, no right is sacred or inviolable . . . neither the right of speech, press, religion, nor private enterprise. Many have even been deprived of life itself; others are left to languish in concentration camps and prisons. It is both logical and psychologically explicable, then, that the majority of these soldiers will not participate in a defensive war for their dictator. Similar conviction, especially about the Croats, is expressed by Winston Churchill, who said:

> It is established that nations who believe their life is at stake will not restrain from using any means to secure their existence. Five million Croats will fight equally against Tito's and Stalin's Communists in case of war or when the time for this comes.

Therefore, there is no substantial basis for American expectations in giving military aid to Tito. Instead of defending

Tito, it is very possible that the populace, after the overthrow of the present regime, will seek their own defense through guerilla warfare, as they have been accustomed to doing for centuries past.

It is to be deplored that the peoples of Yugoslavia are increasingly losing confidence in the United States and her professed anti-communist attitude, because of the latter's past sustained support of the Yugoslav Communist regime. Attitudes and policies must be changed before the dawn brings new enemies upon us. The author's sincere belief is that President Eisenhower, who has thus far nobly manifested his moral convictions in his international policies, will mold an honorable and realistic policy towards Yugoslavia.

Some members of Congress disgrace the solemnity and honor of our legislative body in feigning American economic aid to Marshal Tito by stating that these funds are protecting the obsequious Yugoslav peoples from the pangs of starvation. This groundless justification, although sincerely expressed, is the result of deceptive information—part of the fault lies in the misleading investigation reports of secret U. S. Intelligence agencies whose activities are hindered and obstructed by the incorrigible Yugoslav Government's strict security measures. There is incontrovertible evidence that Tito has not used United States' funds as desired or prescribed by our Foreign Operation's Administration or the Mutual Security Aid program. Our taxpayers' money is actually financing a luxurious and fabulous life for Tito and his ilk, while the Yugoslav peoples remain hungry and suffer from economic despair. Mr. Bogdan Raditsa, former press chief to Marshal Tito, says:

> What is Tito doing with the material goods sent him by the United States' Government and paid for by the American people? He is building a thorough-going Communist regime in Yugoslavia. The food America has sent under the Mutual Security Aid program has gone toward boosting Tito's collectivization program, which deprives Yugoslav peasants of their land and their freedom to work the land as they choose.[19]

The communists are even so bold as to bribe the people into voting for them by offering the starving citizenry American-provided food. When the 'elections' are over, the people again starve.

Since the end of the last world war the United States has aided Tito's regime to the scandalous extent of some one billion dollars, as compared with the seventy millions lent Yugoslavia

[19]This statement is from an article written by Mr. Raditsa in the American Mercury, entitled, "What Price Tito?" Since the author has only a reprint of this article, the exact date of the publication is not known to him.

for business purposes in the last two decades between the wars. At the end of World War II, Yugoslavia received $500 millions in UNRRA (United Nations' Relief and Rehabilitation Administration) goods with, of course, 'no strings attached.' Again we quote from Bogdan Raditsa:

> Tito's communists were the sole authorities permitted to distribute UNRRA supplies to the people. I was then in the Yugoslav government, and saw how those supplies were used to gain support for communism. In every village, it was dinned into the people that the American food supplies and American or Canadian tractors and trucks had been sent by "Mother Russia"—whatever was contributed by the Western world only showed its appreciation of the victory to which "the victorious Communist Party" had led Yugoslavia.
>
> Tito's election in 1945, which won him official recognition by the Western World, was due largely to his use of UNRRA goods as bribes. UNRRA supplies were kept in storage for months, only to be released and distributed as Communist largesse in the weeks preceding the elections. In every corner of the land Tito's agents spread the tidings that the Soviet Union and America and England wanted the people to vote for Tito.[20]

This is how United States' economic aid is being distributed and utilized in Yugoslavia. We must not, however, be surprised about Tito's misuse of American money for, as we have already seen, a precedent of this caliber was established in his use of UNRRA funds. At that time the luxury of a greedy dictator was financed by the United Nations (the majority of these goods came directly from the United States), and now this same ignoble service is singularly performed by the United States.

Now let us summarily reflect on the military aspect of aid to Yugoslavia. The author firmly believes that giving guns and ammunition to a communist government is dangerous indeed to American security, and in view of this and the moral factor, military aid is not at all justified. It is obvious to the whole world that communism has declared itself an enemy of democratic states and institutions, an enemy that is dedicated to the eventual destruction of all fundamental freedoms. Knowing this, we are sadly remiss in giving military assistance to regimented foes. In arming potential belligerents, we should not be amazed if one day the words of Tito's highest officials come true: "One day we shall beat the Americans with their own guns and planes:"[21] Tito, in pleading for U. S. armaments, says that his country is constantly threatened with attack from its borders. The eminent and distinguished Mr. Henry J. Taylor, who toured Yugoslavia last

[20]Ibidem.

[21]Ibidem.

year, concretely refutes this assertion in the following way:

Contrary to what we are told at home, I saw no evidence that Russia is building up her satellite forces for an attack on Yugoslavia, an attack that could hurl the rest of the world into war. Even the Red Yugoslav commissars themselves, as well as our own military people and the British Intelligence in Yugoslavia, confirm this—Tito's propaganda notwithstanding.

Wanting American weapons and money, Tito continually announces fights on his borders and civilian evacuations. Many of his statements appear to be endorsed in the United States as representing an immediate crisis. Yet Tito's own commissars admitted to me that the border incidents are small—a matter of two or three soldiers straying across the line and shooting. Throughout the past two years, total border casualties have actually been less than a dozen.

It has been announced that the United States has decided to give Tito weapons and aid running into stupendous sums. Yet Tito is constantly telling his own people that he would not get into any war as our ally. He is utterly isolationist. His call for millions of dollars is a call for personal self-security.

Tito, an avowed communist, is as opposed as ever to all America stands for. He says this plainly and violently inside Yugoslavia. He is concerned entirely with what is going to happen to himself and his Communist Party, for he has, inside his own country, more enemies than friends. Within Yugoslavia, in fact, Tito is often called "the most hated man in Yugoslavia." And when you ask why, the ordinary Yugoslav will say "because he is a Red and that is not good for us."[22]

That, in summary, is why Marshal Tito so ardently desires American military subsidization—1) to maintain and insure his own self-security, and 2) to prepare for that fateful day when communism will unleash its all to exterminate democratic systems and institute new states where servility to the conquerers will predominate. Aid is also sought for the purpose of buttressing a revolution for a world-wide dictatorship of the proletariat. In view of these facts, the United States' Government must entertain immediate and unqualified cancellation and cessation of military aid to Yugoslav Communism, and, if the decision is made to continue economic aid, provisions should be made whereby direct American supervision of the distribution of every parcel of economic goods is possible. We must make certain that American help is delegated to those who really need it—the starving masses. Otherwise, what is de facto happening to American financial assistance? Communist commissars and members of the militia are living as gods in luxury, while the large masses (especially in barren, unproductive districts) are starving. Let not America be guilty of such a crime.

America has a great obligation incumbent upon her to help the peoples of Yugoslavia liberate themselves from the chains

[22]Henry J. Taylor, **Readers Digest**, November 1951.

of communistic dictatorship. It remains an historic fact that the United States, together with Great Britain and Russia, supported the Yugoslav Communist Party in its bid for political power. Therefore, it is justifiable and prudent to contact and help Yugoslav resistence within and outside Yugoslavia (President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles have already made general recommendations in this field). It would be expedient to coordinate the national resistence groups of the peoples of Yugoslavia on the basis of their human and national rights. Likewise, the way should be prepared for the full recognition of these national rights by the United Nations. It would also be advantageous to contact and coordinate efforts directly with the peoples themselves, for this would be most useful to our government.

Appendix

"Former Soviet appeasers and the left-wing element of the State Department are now the strongest of the advocates of cooperation with Tito. This view has an appreciable following amongst some of the higher officials of the State Department, not excluding the policy-making branch. These men are repelled by the very idea of a Conservative victory elsewhere.

This pro-Tito policy is now reflected in some of the Voice of America broadcasts to Europe. Some funds from American sources are being given to reputed Tito underground movements in the satellite countries. Most of the money finds its way into the pockets of men whose chief attribute is their readiness and ability to make up and render accounts to America. In fact, there is no such thing as a proper Tito underground anywhere. Military circles in Washington, on the other hand, have little confidence in Tito. They say, too, that Tito can no longer return to Moscow, so why pay an exorbitant price for his support?"

(Intelligence Digest, January, 1951, p. 24.)

CHAPTER VII

Communists in the United Nations

In February of 1945, after the most destructive and sanguinary war of all civilization had passed into history, a conference of the Big Three met at Yalta in the Crimea and, among other inefficacious decisions, agreed that a conference of the United Nations should meet at San Francisco on April 25, 1945, to prepare the charter of an organization along the lines proposed at Dumbarton Oaks.[23] The Conference at San Francisco convened as planned and adopted the "Charter of the United Nations" on June 26, 1945.[24] The newly devised multi-lateral Charter was then submitted for formal ratification by the signatory states. This having been completed, the United Nations' Charter became a legally enforceable international document, the Organization a legal international institution.

In the Preamble of the Charter is presented a lucid outline of the specific objectives to be sought for by the United Nations:

> We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and
> to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and
> to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and
> to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, etc.[25]

Now, eight and a half years after the foundation of this Charter, we discern traces of internal weakness and lack of solidarity in the United Nations. Some segments of the world's population are already disappointed with the manner in which the UN has executed the provisions of its Charter. Indeed, some are dubious about whether the UN will continue to function effectively, or even exist. It is not our purpose to discuss the probability or remoteness of questions of this nature, but it is our intention and objective to surface for the reader the present instability and diminution of ethical values within the communist-penetrated United Nations.

The dignity and worth of the human person is based upon man's spiritual and inherent possessions: his immaterial,

[23]Fenwick, Charles G., **INTERNATIONAL LAW**, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts Incorporated, 1948), p. 26.
[24]Ibidem.
[25]Ibidem, p. 688.

immortal soul, and his likeness to God. The fundamental human rights, which have been so savagely supplanted by communist leaders, are inviolable and sacred: the right to life, to have and maintain a family, to procure the means necessary for the development and maintenance of the physical and cultural requirements of human nature—all these are equally possessed by all men and can be removed on no person's authority. Justice is a moral virtue which inclines and enables man to give to his fellow man his due. The inalienable human rights and our obligation to serve and preserve justice are founded upon natural moral law. All of these natural moral standards are also Christian standards; they bear an absolute value and impose an absolute obligation. They are the means by which every individual man, whether citizen or leader, formulates the type of private and public conduct that will aid him to attain his last End, the Highest Good in God. These same standards and values about which we are presently concerned are consistently abrogated by every agnostic, positivist, pragmatic, and materialist.

In our chapter on religion (Chapter 3), we indicated the materialistic principles of communism—principles which the communists propagate and zealously fight for. Also in that same chapter we emphasized that a materialistic philosophy inevitably leads to a conflict with the spiritual world-view, which is so drastically proven in contemporary communist-dominated states. Religious persecution is progressing simultaneously with the suppression of all inalienable human rights. The communists are likewise suppressing human rights both in internal and external affairs of state.

What is the greatest paradox of our century? Communist governments have been graciously accepted as signatory members of the United Nations' Organization without first offering solid proofs of a sincere and serious acceptance of the Charter's high moral obligations. The naivete of the Western Allies, evidenced in World War II's conferences and treaties (Yalta, Potsdam, etc.), was reproduced upon the formulation of the United Nations, when ruthless oppressors of individual and international rights were admitted to equal membership. We knew then as we know now that tyrannical dictatorships existed and do exist in communist states. As the Korean truce negotiations well document, the United Nations has become "a sounding board for Communist propaganda."[26]

Recently a justified and prudent move was taken by the

[26]Speech delivered in the Senate by Senate Majority Leader William F. Knowland of California (Congressional Record, 247074-45959), p. 3.

United States' Government when it sought to reveal American communists employed by the United Nations. After our government investigated these individuals and was certain of their dedication to communism, it immediately ousted them from their important positions. It is our opinion, however, that there is little advantage in such action as long as communist representatives, i. e. Russian, Polish, Yugoslav, etc., are occupying high seats of power in the United Nations. Democratic states should be loyal to each others' institutions and vote for the expulsion of every communist state from the UN. If this were done the Organization would be more solid and would achieve increased universal good. Communist obstructionists will never permit the desired results of a united front.

If such a drastic move were seriously executed, a certain amount of fear would be borne by many of our citizens. They would admonish that such proposals and endeavors would leave us without allies, especially without those allies who are presently collaborating with the communists in dishonest relationships and cooperation, i.e. Great Britain and India. In answer to such protestations, we quote from Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin, who sagaciously states:

> We want allies. But as you well know, if you must fight in the dark, you do not want as your helper a man who is sticking a knife into your back and giving weapons to your enemy.[27]

Justice-loving peoples are also freedom-loving peoples. As regards communist membership in the United Nations, we declare that the free peoples of the world who are represented in this organization cannot and must not be half loyal to those peoples who are enslaved by communists. We cannot effectively combat or defeat communism by halfway measures—to clean the UN of communists would be one noble step in the direction of permanent destruction of a malicious and pagan ideology that imprisons eight hundred million people.

[27]Excerpt from a speech by Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin, (New York Times, September 24, 1953), p. 10-c, column 4.

CONCLUSION

In order to properly conclude this dossier, we consider it contributive to our general theme to summarily reflect upon the predominant ideal of all mankind—international peace.

In contemporary times there are two major attitudes relevant to the means of attaining world peace: that of the West, under the leadership of the United States, and that of the East, dominated and controlled by Russia. Both citadels lack universality of purpose, and neither has any particular affinity towards the other. Current trends solidly indicate that the Eastern (Russian) concept of world peace is not in conformity with that of the Western. Hence, international conflict.

Communist pleas for world peace are, according to all present indications, insincere and negative. It is curious that some European and Asiatic countries continue to talk about the change of attitude of the Russians and the new "peace" policy of Malenkov. Yesterday's disappointments are readily forgotten in the hopes of tomorrow. Actually nothing has occurred since Stalin's death to indicate any change in the perspective of Soviet Russia in her relationship with the West. There have been many words, but no implementation. Communist "desire" for world unity de facto means this: do not disturb us in ruling the peoples and countries which we have conquered—let us go unobstructed in our pursuit of world domination. Communist stalling can also be accounted for in another way: they wish to have sufficient time to rearm in order to capacitate themselves to conquer the world and establish a "dictatorship of the proletariat." These factors are the sole bases of Russia's idea of world peace.

How is the West combatting communist strategy? Some of the most influential Western leaders erroneously think that we do not have the necessary potential to defeat Russia, or that an offensive approach against the communist menace would be too sacrificial. This attitude is strengthened when there is talk of directly liberating peoples who are enslaved by communist regimes. Moreover, these same men consider it sufficient to merely protect the traditional Western freedoms. Then there is the wise warning that we must establish as nearly an invincible self-defense system as possible. Recently such motives were voiced by one of the members of the President's Cabinet, who said that the United States' creed does not call for export of revolution into countries in the Soviet bloc. Apparently, the underlying reason for such convictions is the fear that if such policies were pursued, another world war would ensue. This fear has been climaxed by the recent announcements that Soviet Russia now possesses atomic and thermo-nuclear weapons. There is, of course, justification for fearing an atomic war with Russia. However, there is such a phenomenon as a selfish concern for one's own well-being and

individualistically forgetting about the millions of other peoples in the world.

It is certainly a grave obligation for all of us to avoid or at least delay a war. However, do there not exist other means of effectively assisting people behind the Iron Curtain? For example: how did the communists seize control over Hungary and Czechoslovakia after World War II without bloody revolution? It is not necessary to speak here about the "export" and "import" of revolution because freedom in the enslaved countries cannot be realized without substantial cooperation with the enslaved peoples. In every country the communists have a Fifth Column that is prepared to move immediately upon a directive from Moscow. This Fifth Column is composed of domestic communists—in Italy, Italians; in France, Frenchmen; in the United States, Americans, etc. Do the Western Democracies have such organized groups in communist countries? There are numerous ways whereby we can effect the overthrow of communist governments without inflicting global war upon mankind.

In regard to Yugoslavia, it would be necessary to implement those measures suggested in Chapter Five. As we have already noted, Tito would undergo numerous obstacles and crises if he were deprived of United States' military and economic assistance. What about the paramount problem—how are we to liberate the peoples of Yugoslavia from communist totalitarianism? Some evident possibilities are as follows: (1) immediate cancellation of all United States' military aid to Tito; if economic aid is continued, it must be only conditionally—United States' agents must directly supervise the distribution of all economic goods to needy people; and (2) contact resistance groups in the respective area, as well as those who have immigrated to foreign countries, and give them, at the very minimum, moral support. Internal and external antagonism among immigrant groups is partly responsible for the maintenance of the status quo in Yugoslavia. Most important of all, we can encourage these peoples in their struggle for freedom only if we cease giving aid to their tyrannic and despotic ruler.

In the problems that lie ahead, we can be successful in solving them only on two conditions: first, we must be united in effort and purpose, and second, we must all pray to God for His guidance and blessings. If these two conditions are faithfully served, we can march triumphantly towards that world where liberty and freedom will prevail and where the world will be made secure for democratic life. To this end, we can all be proud to serve unselfishly the cause of humanity and, if necessary, give our life that justice to all men everywhere may be assured and preserved.

Price $1.25